## PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SYMINARY PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. Gresham Machen P.O. Address - Box 4, Princeton, H.J.

May 4, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer The Board of Foreign Missions Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 156 Fifth Avenue New York, M.Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Please let me thank you for your letter of April 30th, which has come into my hands today. I am exceedingly grateful for the careful may in which you have commented upon my paper, - CAN EVANCELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

I wish that I could say that your letter had removed my objections to the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions, but in point of fact it has tended rather to the confirmation of those objections. My reply in detail will have to be deferred until I can give the considerations adduced in the letter the detailed examination which they certainly deserve. Meanwhile I am deferring publication of my paper.

The appeal for peace in the Church and between us, with which your letter closes, seems rather strange at a time when you are actively engaged in the attack upon the conservative control of Princeton Seminary and in the effort to substitute the policy favored by the resident for the policy which the institution is bound by the most solemn trust obligations to maintain. The policy of tolerance hardly seems to work both ways. The conservatives are not only to tolerate in the Church but also to give active support to the message that you proclaim; while you, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying almost the last remaining powerful agency which the conservatives possess for the propagation of their Faith in the Presbyterian Church.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

April 1., 1929

Fr. Pob rt L. Speer, Th. Jo rd of Foreign Missions The Syterian Church in th. U.S.A. 15 Fifth Avenue, No. York City

My orr Ir. Speer:

You will no doubt remember that in 1926 you and it. " rouis it correspondence with a regarding my criticism of the Boards of Forein n'N time! Missions. The correspondence embraced your letters ( ign d cointly by you and by Dr. rouis) of i reh 24, April 8, May 8, Jun 8, Pr. Werquis' latter of October 6, and my letters of March 80, April 80, my 5, August 9, and October 29. A simil r subject was east with by Ir. John chowell' letter of January 13, 1927, and by my reply of January 27,1927, then reply, lines it coalt chiefly with the Board of Foreign "i.sions, Br. "cho all his my express paralission to show to you.

May I call you ttention, also, to a correspondence ich I have hid with the Fev. Lindsay S.B. Hadley, Canadate Secretary of the Board of Foreign Mi sions - a correspondence embracing my letters of February .7, Mirch 7, April 7, 1918 and 4 reh 5, 1929, and Mr. Hidley's letters of 4 reh 1, Airch 8, April 13, 1918, and a reh 28, 1919. In the 1 st letter Mr. Hadley refers me to you and to Dr. Brown. No doubt, to refere, I and acting contrary to his ishes when I bring the correspondence to our attention.

In my letter to you of M rch 'J, 1926, I mentioned my intention "to proper a statement which will set forth more in cetail my views on it subject of the Boards and will ground my objections to their policy more fully than as possible in a general secress."

This intention I have been as y t unable, because of the press of other duties, to carry out in any comprehensive way. But m, objections to the policy of the Foreign Board have not be me less but rather are ter than in 1926; and there are certain phases of the might of I included to their immediately to range to the attention of any of evangelical conviction in the result of Church.

Accordingly, I molocia product I have meared, entitled to five elical Christians Support our Foreign Bo rd?" You will unit tend that it is only the released for publication, but is submitted to you for examination a criticism. If the is enythin in hat I have said that is untrue or sajunt, I must be use a were enxiou to correct it. I shall be extremely are toful for any and that it is untrue to that end.

Ver. inc rely ; un.,

( ignoa) J. Great Michin.

an Inquiry Presented for the Consideration of the Evangelical Members

of the

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By

J. Gresham Machen

Every agency appealing for funds should be willing to give an account of its stewardship to those to whom it appeals. This principle applies to the Board of Foreign Missions of our Presbyterian Church. The Board is supported not by a tax levied on the members of the Church, but by voluntary contributions. If contributors think that their gifts are being devoted by the Board to the ends for the sake of which they have contributed them, then they will continue their support; otherwise they cannot reasonably be expected to do so.

There are some contributors who need have no hesitation about continuing their support of the Board. Those are the contributors that are interested in the social or material or educational aspects of the Board's work. It is perfectly clear that our Foreign Board is performing a valuable humanitarian service in many parts of the world, and those who want to contribute to such a humanitarian service may probably have confidence in this particular agency. But there are other contributors who may well have grave doubts as to whether they are justified in continuing their gifts. These are the contributors who are interested in propagating the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God. Can these Bible-loving and Bible-believing Christians conscientiously continue their support of our Foreign Board?

Obviously the question cannot possibly be answered by pronouncements of the General Assembly; for the distrust which evangelical Christians have with respect to the Board itself applies in equal measure to the Assembly. When, indeed, the issue between the Bible and modern belief is clearly presented, the Assembly usually stands on the side of the Bible; [1] repeated pronouncements have affirmed that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resuggection, and the miracles of our Lord, are essential doctrines of our Faith (2). But these pronouncements have been made, practically speaking, a dead letter by the fact that the machinery of the Church is almost altogether in the hands of those who are concealing the real gravity of the situation that exists. Evasive reports as to the state of the Church, like that of the Commission of Fifteen of 1925-1927, will hardly restore the confidence of evangelical Christians; on the contrary, they will in the end do more to destroy confidence than any open presentation of the facts could possibly do. If. therefore, the Foreign Board is to regain the lost confidence of evangelical Christians in the Church, it cannot do so by any appeal to ecclesiastical

<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly stood on the side of the Bible in the "Gantz case" in 1925. In 1927, in the judicial case concerning the licensure of candidates in the Presbytery of New York, it stood against the Bible and in favor of modern unbelief, but only because of the fact that the Moderator, Dr. Speer, quite illegally permitted the representatives of the Synod of New York, who were parties in interest, to vote in the case.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1910 confirmed by that of 1925 (Minutes, 1923, p. 253).

committees, but can only do so by meeting squarely the objections of individual givers. These individual givers must still raise the question: "Can evangelical Christians conscientiously contribute to our Foreign Board?"

I shall not now attempt to answer that question in any comprehensive way; I shall not attempt any comprehensive examination of the work which the Board is carrying on in foreign lands; but shall merely refer to certain disquieting facts which have come under my immediate observation. Those disquieting facts concern, first, the treatment of candidates for the mission field and, second, the pronouncements of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

I.

With regard to the former subject, my position as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary has given me rather unusual opportunities for observation. I have been thrown into close spiritual contact with a large body of young men who graduate from our seminary from year to year. These young men, of course, differ widely as to the clearness with which they have received into their minds and hearts the gespel of the Gross of Christ; and, in particular, they differ widely in the degree of bravery with which they are resolved to proclaim that gospel in the presence of the unbelief now rampant in the Church. But the large majority of them - indeed a proportion truly smazing in view of the hostile forces now abroad in the world - have resolved to stand firmly for that gospel of the Cross, and firmly against the current indifferentism and unbelief.

Some of these men have cherished as the ambition of their lives the thought of going to the foreign mission field. At last the time approaches for the realization of their high resolve. They meet in conference with representatives of our Board of Foreign Missions. What impression is made by these conferences upon their minds? Are these young men commended for the clearness with which they recognize the insufficiency of all other ways of salvation save the Cross of Christ considered as a substitutionary death for our sins; are they warned against the deadly peril of making cosmon cause with those who preach the "other gospel" of agnostic Modernism; are they encouraged to trust, not in ecclesiastical combinations of human influences, but simply and solely in the Spirit of God making use of the blessed gospel that the Scriptures contain; are they commended for their understanding of the distincti eness of our Reformed Faith over against various subtractions from the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God; are they confirmed in their sense of the high liberty of the Presbyterian minister whether at home or abroad? I can certainly, to say the least, find no clear evidence that such is the case. On the contrary, these young men, so far as I can judge by the spiritual effect on them, are given the impression that they are expected to conform to the policy of church dooperation and union which the representatives of the Board favor, and that not separation from the non-Christian world, whether within or without the visible Church, but cooperation with those who differ from us is the crying need of the hour.

My impression with regard to thie matter is strengthened by the

official "Candidate Reference Blank" which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries. The reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others". "desire to progress in spiritual truth," "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions on this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ as it is set forth in Holy Scripture, and whether he himself is clear in his understanding of the great issue between supernaturalism and naturalism, between evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the Church. There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Such a questionnaire. because of the choose of leading questions, creates very plainly the impression that "tolerance of opposing views" is far more valued by the Foreign Board than loyalty to the whole ord of God.

The same impression is also created by the "Application Form" which the candidates themselves are asked to fill out. That form contains the following question "Section I, question 17):

Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own epinions?

It is difficult to see how any Christian man, certainly how any Protestant, can possibly answer such a question in the affirmative. The Rev. Lindsay S.B. Madley, indeed, the Candidate Jecretary of the Board, In his letter to me of March 8, 1928, distinguishes between "opinions" and "convictions":

This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which m turally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout.

But in making this distinction between opinions and convictions, Mr. Hadley seems to differ sharply from the Form of Government of our Church, where in Chapter I, Nection iv, it is said:

and that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are (italics mine). Here the word "opinion" seems clearly to be used in the sense in which Mr. Hadley uses the word "conviction". And surely, in this difference, the Form of Government and not Mr. Hadley is right. The man who does not share a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as an "opinion"; the man who does share it is inclined to regard it as a "conviction". "Opinion" and "conviction", therefore, from the point of view with which we are now concerned, are practically speaking synonymous terms. I still do not see, therefore, how any evantelical Christian, in this day of widespread defection from the faith, can possibly answer in the affirmative the question in the Application Form.

This impression is despend by an examination of Section IV in the Application Form, which deals with "Religious Experience". That section is declared by the Candidate Secretary in the letter to which reference has already been made, to be "very definite". The secretary writes as follows:

This question (question 17 of Section I) as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 3 under "deligious Experience", which, as you will see are very definite (italics mine).

Let us now turn to those statements which Mr. Hadley declared to be "very definite". The only questions in the section which can by any chance be referred to are questions 3.5.6. The last two of these read as follows:

- 5. Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord, and Master?
- 6. Is it your purpose to make this the \_shief aim of your missionary career, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?

Are these the questions which Mr. Hadley regards as "very definite"?

Surely the adjective as applied to them is strangely misplaced; for the questions are utterly vague. All the terms used - "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" - are used today in such widely diverse senses that the questions could be answered in the affirmative by men who from the point of view of the Bible and of evangelical Christians are unbelievers of a very thoroughgoing kind. That the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Missions should speak of such studiedly vague language as being "very definite" raises in very insistent fashion the question whether evangelical Christians can possibly continue to contribute to such a Board.

This question becomes still more insistent when we examine the remaining one of the three questions to which reference has just been made.

That question is question 3. It reads as follows:

3. Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?

This question must surely be taken in connection with question 17 of tection I which has been quoted above. The caudidate must have no views that prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, and he must be willing to submit his opinion to the majority vote of any group of such missionaries to which he may belong. It is surely a large promise; and we ought to consider carefully what it may involve. That may those "opinions" be which the candidate must, on occasion, be allowed to override his own?

The impression has certainly been made upon some candidates that among the opinions which he is required to allow to over-ride his own are opinions like those which led to the formation of the United Church of Canada; the impression has clearly been made that former service in the Presbyterian Church of Canada (called by its enemies the "Continuing Presbyterian Church) is to be regarded as a ground of suspicion when a candidate comes before the representatives of our Board. Mr. Hadley says that that is not the case; yet in view of his correspondence with me I cannot see how any other impression could possibly have been produced. The whole impression is that the candidate must be ready on occasion to give up the Faith of our Church in accordance with a majority vote, as though he were merely changing a suit of clothes.

At any rate there is one set of "opinions" with which a missionary in these days can hardly avoid contact. It is the kind of opinion represented by the "Auburn affirmation", which declares in perfectly plain language that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are non-essential even for the ministers in our Church. The Affirmation has been signed by about thirteen hundred of our ministers, and unquestionably the point of view that it represents is shared by we y large numbers of ministers who did not sign it. What guarantee has the candidate that such opinions are not represented on our mission field, and that it is not to such opinions that he is being asked by question 17 to be willing to submit his own?

But it is not merely such general disquietude that suggests itself in this connection. For it is a fact - a fact which will come as a surprise and shock to many evangelical Christians throughout the Church, but still a fact all the same - that hr. Hadley, the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Board, is himself a signer of the Affirmation. This Secretary, who fills this peculiarly important position, who stands in this peculiarly intimate relation to the men who desire to devote themselves to foreign mission work, is a signer of a formal statement that is hostile not only to evangelical Christianity but to all Christianity at its very root.

The cancer of the Auburn Affirmation and what it epresents, moreover, cuts far deeper into our Foreign Board than merely by the presence of an

affirmationist in the position of Candidate Secretary. Bo less than four among the fifteen ministerial members of the Board are signers of this notable anti-evangelical pronouncement. And what, in this situation, is the attitude of the staff, as distinguished from the governing members, of the Board? Dr. Robert E. Speer, surely, is qualified to give the answer. His answer is given in a letter which he sent to me, jointly with Dr. John A. Marquis of the Board of Rational Missions, on May 6, 1926:

First - all the members of the Board of the Church were elected by the General Assembly. The Assembly clearly believed that they were loyal and faithful ministers and members of the Church. We know of not one who does not accept the Constitution and Standards of the Church and who is not truly and loyally evangelical.

At the time when that letter was written, no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the Mational Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the Foreign Board were signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Yet all these gentlemen are regarded as "truly and loyally evangelical" by Dr. Marquis and Dr. Speer: "that possible confidence can really consistent evangelical Christians have in Boards whose standards of what is truly and loyally evangelical are such as this? What kind of mission work is it in which the full truthfulness of Holy Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are, all and severally, regarded as non-essential? Certainly it is a kind of mission work which no consistent evangelical Christian can support.

Is it such questions with regard to which candidates for the mission field are required to show "tolerance of the point of view of others"? The whole tendency, the whole attitude of the Candidate Department strongly creates such an impression. The question is not whether non the lukewarm in their testimony against Modernism will be sent to the foreign field, but whether men who are faithful in their testimony, will be sent. One thing at least is clear: No real evangelical Christian, certainly no intelligent one, can possibly, without disloyalty to his Saviour and Lord, contribute to any mission work that is favorable to the point of view represented by the Auburn Affirmation. The Affirmation is hostile to repeated pronouncements of the General Assembly. But that is not the serious objection to it. The really serious objection to it is that it is hostile to the Tord of God.

II.

A second cause of disquiet regarding the Foreign Board is found in the utterances of Dr. Rebert E. Speer.

Among those utterances, one deserves special attention. It is the booklet, "are Foreign Missions Done For?" which Dr. Speer has recently dis-

tributed widely in the Church. "This little book", says the preface, "is an attempt to meet fairly and honestly some of the present day questions which are raised with regard to the foreign missionary enterprise." The booklet has been widely distributed, and evidently it is intended by its author to be an apologia for the work of our Foreign Board. Here then, if anywhere, the evangelical Christian might fairly expect to obtain some sert of answer to the questions which he has felt obliged to raise.

Are such expectations satisfied? We are obliged to say very plainly that they are not. Far from setting forth any clearly evangelical position on the great specific questions that agitate the Church, Dr. Speer's book from beginning to end is dishearteningly evanive and vague.

This vagueness appears in most distressing form just when the author seems to suppose that what he says is particularly clear. No less than twice in the course of the book Dr. Speer quotes an utterance made by a conference held at Princeton in 1920 [1]. That utterance, he says has "nothing uncertain or confused" about it; "it is definite and comprehensive" [2.56]. The evangelical reader will naturally turn with high hopes to an utterance for which such claims are advanced. Surely, he will say, the utterance must set forth in no uncertain terms the authority of the written Tord as over against the current mysticism that turns rather to Christian experience or Christ in the soul; surely it must declare the absolute necessity, for every missionary, of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

Are such hopes realised? What is this evangelical etterance which Dr. Speer declares to be so comprehensive and so plain? The evangelical Christian may have difficulty in believing his eyes when he finds that the following is all that it is:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become his disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

<sup>(1)</sup> Pp. 56, 81. In one other place, also, a practically identical declaration is quoted. (p. 64).

Such is the utterance which is declared to be so definite and so clear: No doubt it will seem clear to the agnostic hodernism that is rampant in our Church; for it is couched in just the vague, ambiguous language that Modernism loves. All the terms - "Lord", "Divine Saviour", "disciples", and, alas, "Jesus Christ" are used today in senses entirely alien to the Word of God; and the utterance ignores altogether the grand particularities of the Christian faith. The utterance speaks of "the spirit and principles of Christ"; but "spirit" is spelled with a small letter and the Third Person of the blessed Trinity is ignored; the utterance speaks of Jesus as Saviour, but there is nothing about the sin from which He saves or the Cross by which salvation was wrought; the utterance speaks of bringing to bear upon human life "the spirit and principles of Christ", but there is nothing about the necessity of the mysterious, regenerating work of God's Spirit, without which "the spirit and principles of Christ" (whatever they may be are quite powerless to save men from wrath to come. In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the precious blood of Christ. Yet Dr. Speer says (p.81): "No better answer can be given to those who wish to know that our foreign missionaries conceive that they are about and how they are setting about it than to quote the more important of the Findings of this Conference". (1) We can only say that if this be the answer which our Foreign Board has to give regarding the content of the Christian message, then it is difficult to see how evangelical Christians can continue their support of the Board. So far as this declaration indicates, the Board may be propagating the vague "other gospel" of non-doctrinal Modernism just as probably as the blessed gospel that the Bible contains.

The vagueness that characterizes this atterance also characterizes the whole booklet of Dr. Speer. There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all), no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ? What sort of gospel is it from which all that makes a gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away, but so is the glory and the power.

Some of the testimonies to which he appeals seem to us, indeed, very unconvincing. There are the testimonies of non-Christian men in mission countries - testimonies to the "moral and spiritual values" of Christianity, to the loftiness of Jesus' teaching and example, to the transforming power of his "principles." Sadness comes over us as we read Br. Speer's rehearsal of such testimonies. Would they ever have been rendered if missionaries had been faithful in preaching the real Christ? The plain fact is that the real Christ advanced stapendous claims. Unless those claims are true, He is not a perfect

<sup>(1)</sup> Then follows (pp.81-85) the paragraph quoted above and a fuller transcript of the findings of the Conference, which, however, does not really go beyond this paragraph so far as questions of principles are concerned.

(2) There is one bare mention of "the Crucified and ever Living Lord". (p.37).

ideal at all. He uttered a "hard saying"; and many of His former followers went back and walked no more with Him. Has that hard saying been kept in the background today, that Jesus might win this superficial and patronizing favor among those who have not been born again? Gould that favor ever have been won if missionaries had put Calvary in its proper place, if they had been willing to bear the offense of the Cross? Such questions do arise in our minds when we read Dr. Speer's enthusiastic words about the permeation of the nations with Christian principles and the Christian "spirit".

We do not, indeed, undervalue a good testimony to Christian living by those who are without. How often in recent years has such testimony been wrung from unwilling lips by those who amid the firet of persecution have been true to Jesus Christ: Still, the message of the Cross, when it is faithfully presented, is a very offensive thing. It is to the Jesus a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. When the offense of it is avoided, we are inclined to doubt the faithfulness of the preaching. God grant that the Church, both at home and abroad, may never be ashamed of the offense of the Cross:

But if we differ from Dr. Speer in the arguments by which we defend foreign missions, we agree with him with all our souls in the conclusion. We agree with him in holding that foreign missions are the only hope of the world. Indeed far more poignant is our sense of the need of foreign missions than is his. For we do not share his favorable view of human nature (1); the primary fact, we hold, is that mankind everywhere is lost in sin. We cannot keep that fact in the deckground as Dr. Speer does. It and it alone constitutes the really profound need of the world. How great then is the obligation to preach the one message that will save lost sinners and bring them into peace with God:

But where is that message to be found? There are missionaries to find the message that they shall proclaim throughout the world? That is surely a basic question. Yet no clear answer to it can be found in Dr. Speer's book - certainly not the true answer. Dr. Speer speaks of "the search for the infinite riches of God in Christ" (p.37), "a quest for an ever enlarging understanding of the fulness of Christ" (ibid.); but nowhere does he speak of the ceriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the true source of the missionary message. He hopes for "some exposure of treasures in Christ or in the New Testament or in the Holy Spirit which have been hidden as yet". (p.46) se cannot help feeling that the Bible is here removed from the unique place in which it is put -- and rightly put -- in the standards of our Church. Hew exposures of truth, Dr. Speer says, are to be expected from Christ or from the New Testament or from the Holy Spirit. What boundless confusion is

<sup>(1) &</sup>quot;That is needed", Dr. Speer says, (p.41), "is that everywhere in all lands men should be set free from what is evil and bad and that human good should be built by God's help through Christ and His Gospel." What a difference there is between this tsaching and Jesus' words to Nicodemush "To must be born again": Compare the beginning of Dr. Speer's book, "The unfinished Task of Foreign hissions (1926), where, on pp. 10f., the use of human goodness - illustrated by Jerome K. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back" - is represented as being the method of Jesus:

is here, what woeful lack of clearness as to the very foundation of all missionary work: (1)

What is the missionary to say when he begins work on his field? Is he to appeal to a Christ in his own soul, is he to draw from his own experience for the content of his message, is he to place the treasures which he finds in the New Testament alongside of other treasures which he finds in Christ or in the Hely Spirit? If he does so, he has deserted the basis upon which all the teaching of our Church rests — namely, the authority of the blessed written Ford of God.

Very different should be the attitude of the true missionary of the Cross. His function is a humbler function, and yet a function which in its humility may prove to be the most glorious function of all. His function is not to draw upon mystical experience of his own for the content of his message, but simply to set forth what is taught in God's word — both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, both in the words of Jesus in the Cospels and in the words of the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of Paul. The function of the true missionary is simply to open the pages of the Holy Book and say: "Thus saith the Lord."

He cannot, indeed, do that with any power unless he has received the nessage in his own heart, unless he knows in his own soul the living Saviour whom the Scriptures present. The Holy Spirit must illumine for him the sacred page. But the content of his message will be based upon the Bible and upon the Bible alone.

When the message is based upon the Bible alone, the content of the message will be very different from that which now is heard. Gone will be all vagueness like the vagueness of Dr. Speer's little book. Instead, there will stand out the great verities which the Church is commissioned to set forth—the awful holiness of God, the deadly guilt and power of sin, the true deity of our hord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His mighty sirucles, His obedience to the 1 w, His righteeneness with which believers are clothed, His sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, His glorious resurrection in the body in which he suffered, His ascension into Heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the utter powerlessness of man, the sovereign grace of God by which alone are made alive those who were dead in trespasses and sins, the new and right relation to God received only by those in whom the Holy Spirit has wrought faith, the new walk and conversation of those who have been received by God and made alive from the dead, the dread yet glorious hope of Christ's supernatural appearing in glory when He shall come to judge

<sup>(1)</sup> Dempare Dr. Speer's book "The New Opportunity of the Church", 1919, p. 44: "Deeper and more religious meanings than we have ever proclaimed are discerned in the Gross of Christ, revealed and illustrated in the war." Poes Dr. Speer mean that these new "meanings" are deeper and more religious than those that are set forth in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians or in the eighth chapter of Romans? And have these Scriptural "meanings" never been proclaimed from New Testament times until the World War? Ah, how far are we here from the majestic simplicity of the wospel of the Gross:

the world.

A new and glorious day will it be for the distracted Church when that message again shall ring out clear, when there shall be a return from the imaginations of men's hearts to God's Holy Word. We anwhile there are those who already love and honor that Word. What shall they do in the present day? Can they continue to support a mission agency that has wandered so far? There are many men and women in our Church who are raising that question. And they will raise it yet more earnestly if they read Dr. Speer's little book with care.

## CONCLUSION

should that, then, evangelical Christians now do? Can they conscientiously continue their contributions to such a Board?

The question might seem to have been answered by shat has already been said. But the answer is not really quite so simple as it seems. We ought never to forget that despite the attitude of the Board there are many faithful missionaries under the Board who are proclaiming the full gospel as it is set forth in the whole Word of God. Those faithful missionaries of the Cross should not be allowed to suffer because of the faults of the administrative agency under which they stand. Until some truly evangelical agency is formed to care for those faithful missionaries, evangelical people cannot withhold their support of the present Board.

Eut has the time not come for the establishment of a truly evangelical missionary agency in the Presbyterian Church — an agency to which evangelical Christians can contribute, not with hesitation and distruct, but with all confidence and joy, an agency which shall keep clear of entangling alliances and shall proclaim the full glories of the Reformed Faith as they are found in the Word of God? The question may well be ruised; it may well be commended to the prayerful consideration of that large body of Christian laymen in our Church who love their Bibles and the crucified Saviour set forth therein, who know that the "principles of Jesus" will never save the world — nor what Dr. Speer calls his "redeeming life" [1]— but only His precious redeeming blood, who are not seeking the patronizing testimony of non-Christian men, which Dr. Speer rehearses at such length, but who are willing to bear the offense of the Gross.

If such an evangelical agency is formed, its virtue must be not merely negative but positive; it must not only avoid denying the gospel, but it must preach the gospel in all its fullness and in all its power. One fundamental vice underlies the defense of the present Board; its representatives seem to think that the burden of proof is to be placed upon those who deny that the Board is sounding an evangelical note. "Be definite in your charges", they say in effect; "point out individual missionaries against whom charges of

<sup>(1)</sup> The relation of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise to the World Cituation of Today," in Christian Students and World Problems, 1924, p. 139.

heresy can be preferred. or else keep silent with your criticism and continue your support." That is the trouble with such a line of defense? Is it not that the defense is negative merely? The assumption seems to be that if the missionaries or the secretaries of the Board cannot be proved to be saving that which is contrary to the gospel of Christ, then all is well. But cannot these gentlemen really understand any better then that the point of view of evangelical Christians in our Church? Cannot they understand that what evangelical Christians demand is not an agency that avoids denying the gospel of the Cross of Christ. that perhaps pays perfinctory lip service to it on explicit demand, but an agency that is on fire with that mospel, that never for one moment keeps it in the background, that preaches it in season and out of season, that combats what is contradictory to it, that presents it as the only way of salvation for lost and dying men? If in answer to the present paper Br. Speer should affirm his pelief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have seen able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away -- if he should affirm his bolief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn affirmationists have done despite. If even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs, still our objections would not really be removed. That we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not, we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with His own precious blood. Woe be to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gosnel than the gosnel of the Cross. And may God show us now we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world:

## PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY PRINCETON? NEW JERSEY

J. Gresham Machen P.O. Address - Box 4, Princeton, N.J.

May 4, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer The Board of Foreign Missions Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 156 Fifth Avenue New York, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Please let me thank you for your letter of April 30th, which has come into my hands today. I am exceedingly grateful for the careful way in which you have commented upon my paper, - CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

I wish that I could say that your letter had removed my objections to the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions, but in point of fact it has tended rather to the confirmation of those objections. My reply in detail will have to be deferred until I can give the considerations adduced in the letter the detailed examination which they certainly deserve. Meanwhile I am deferring publication of my paper.

The appeal for peace in the Church and between us, with which your letter closes, seems rather strange at a time when you are actively engaged in the attack upon the conservative control of Princeton Seminary and in the effort to substitute the policy favored by the resident for the policy which the institution is bound by the most solemn trust obligations to maintain. The policy of tolerance hardly seems to work both ways. The conservatives are not only to tolerate in the Church but also to give active support to the message that you proclaim; while you, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying almost the last remaining powerful agency which the conservatives possess for the propagation of their Faith in the Presbyterian Church.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

Protessor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Box A., Princeton, Tew ersey.

"y dear Dr. Machen,

I have already acknowledged the receipt of your letter of April 12, 1920, with your accompanying paper entitled "Can Ivan elical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" which you asked me to expine and criticize in order that if it contained anything "untrue or unjust" you might correct it. You court ously added that you would be grateful for any assistance that I might reserve to this end. I am very glad to respond and to try to hap you to a affirmative answer to the question of your paper. I believe that you christian convictions are not less evangelical than yours, and I believe that our for iso missionary work and orkers are also truly evangelical. If I were not convicted of both of these things I should not be a sociate with our foreign Board or with the Presbyterian Church. And I use the fore evangelical, will appear, in its plain and honest sense of filelity to the call Scriptural warrant and content of the Gospel.

I will try first to indicate particular points it your part which appear to me to be "untrue or unjust" and the I the I the paper of whole.

Your central and implied out 30 leads to the the others to be ervice" of the Board and "propagating the 3 of 1 or one Christ . It is extained in the whole ord of God" appears to a to b u to a lastra e un-Scriptural. It is of course possible to divide the circular of the not the second from the first. The Cospel includes human arvise. The Ter-Testament is full of that principle. It is rists on such a rvice a one of the evidences and fruits of filelity to the Gospel. . . urtharmore, it is by the evpression of the Gospel in deeds as will are in ords that the Jour 1 are preach d and is wer to be presched. Indeed, in many languages that were no orde high had the significance of the English or Great and abodying the truth: of the Gosp I and in the languages old words had to be taken and give a second tent by life, as the Incurnation and it. interpretation and at the beginning. It is true that our Board is carrying on a great been on human ervice and any a the is lesirous of doing such ork can not find may b ther opportunity for it than her , but out Bours has alrays add it periotily clear that is our olicy all philanthropic ork is tributary to n'aspoci to ith the primary in of evangelisation. I have expressed by on convictions of this point again and One wotation from " issionary . riveigl . . . ? Fractice " (13. :) till wi-"In all use of phil athropic if rt, sich a cocird discions, r lie" work, etc., at a method of mission work, the dominant and iterating im ment

be evantelistic. Such work is up july at a curl gurt . higher visting and a prorepresenting the helpful, uncelfish spirit of Christinity, contribution to the preaching of Christ, and the rowlation of Him . . . . viour and Lor . the mare of all life and hope, and as relieving suffering; but it is so the regarditity of the foreign missionary onterprise to sure for the sich car and run of the Times of critical need may occur, as in great 1 is the bill of when a broad liberty of action must be recognized; but in reard, the in four chilanthropic work should be to contribute directly to the pre-chily of the Good 1, the establi hount of the Christian Church, and to the fore ring of that Christian spirit which will provide, through the nativ Church hick is gro ing up of through the people threselves, the salutary fruits of Christianity in philanthropic and As a missionary method, while thropic work shoul ordin rihumanitarian affort. ly be limited, therefore, by the possibility of its very listle utilization and influence. A small development of such work contributing powerfully in the lirection indicated is better than a large devalors at of but feeble or in in et evangelistic influence." I think it is an error in your paper . ' in all your books that you do not adequately recognize all not forth the full betries of the Scriptures, namely, that the Gospel is to be are cheed not by word only but the and not less r les. fundamentally by seeds of lave and morey. In that preach by word and dead by our Presbyterian Church! "ission true fraitage has followed. Converts have been son on churches have best established of the rout and of true New Testiment character to have resulted from the ork of any other illies . You are invited to make any comparison you plant, including the added to the Missions thick you have sometimes praired for that you regard to their a rior doctrinal ricelity.

Church at large against your approximate of if the General bly a the Church at large against your approximate of if there are your intention that the Church and the Assembly are not really very limit. I believe that are Church is every limit. I dish with you that it are better instructed in the Assembly are not the Copy of the Policy and really a truly every limit of the Copy of that I believe, that it is a Tiefully has not lost its confidence. There are, or cour, individual, like yourself, who seek and express distruct, but I believe you at they are misseance in this and that the Church is warmly and very limitedly layed on the documents.

Jarrapa I should by order thing the potential to the Jarral assembly in 1927, here, against by relaction in protect, I am an lower tor. We to my action in connection with Judici I U. 1. I, I are down into any action in connection with Judici I U. 1. I, I are down into all protections of the constitution of the vertical matter of the York by not on the relation, to the set of the heart of a line vote. There are not, hower, the only vote ill gally cost. The for the protection of the reportation of the court of the protection of the church it is better to pass them ever, but if this matter is so be brought for at the shole story should be unclined in the latter to be be brought for a the chole story should be unclined in the latter in the story and the matter my position.

I note your the control to soly but sorth of any more what is the foreign Board by the Control to solly but sorth proposed think sor kindly of the resolutions of the translate that Grand Rapids is 1874 Sopt to Figure 1889 of the Standing Committee on Torong Tiroton. of With Dr. 100 1

J. G. Machen - - . 4/7 / 13

Chairman and Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was a member, sith regar! to union and coop rative enterprises, the selection of missionary candidates, the use of schools and hospitals, and the proclamation of the Gospel shich, however, the Committee did not feel bound to describe and define. These were four of the resolutions:

That while maintaining loyally the policy established by p. t General Assemblics in repeated enactments with regard to cooperation with other Evangelical bodies in our Foreign Missionary Nork the Board be directed to exercise due care with regard to the Evangelical character of all such union and cooperative enterprises, and if there should arise in the Nork of these enterprises a situation in which teachings unsound or injuriousmto the Evangelical Faith are given, the Board, as it has declared to be its policy, should ither secure the correction of such a situation or failing such withdraw from further participation.

"That the Bourd be commended for its care in the selection and appointment of Caudidates for the Foreign Field, and that they be requested to continue to exercise the most scrupulous care in this regard.

"That we rejoice in all the course in thich is home and Church, in hospital and school, by word and by the printed pay, Christ has been provided to men, and we assure the Li sionaries and notive Church's of our hope and prayer that the program of displacent direct Tyangelian by be so increased that the Gospel may be carried to all the people for whose evengelization we are responsible.

"That in this hour when the world's need of Christ is so madifiest and desperate, when the opportunities read that, and need of antronce are opened into lands like afghanistan, high have been nitherto closed, when young men and comen are off ring themselves from like for service, when our dissiparties and Churches ith shigh they are writing are every for a great sounce, when the problems of mental of no loss and of rices cry out, consciously or unconsciously, for Christ is their only solution, when the experience of the party of the result are the Church the adequate resources which are will be to faith and low through the grace of God, this issee bly here and now dedicates the literal are calle upon the Church to consecrate herealf aresh to a new obdience to the last command of our glorified bord and to a full acceptanc of His Leadership in the supreme task of making the Gospel known to all marking and of establishing His Kingdom over all the carth."

Frinceton Seminary students by their conferences with represent tives of our coreign Board. The bus representatives of our Board its whom the students have most contact are makers of the faculty of Princeton Lainary and the full varietical loyalty of their personal convictions has, I think, not be a mastioned. It is not the other hand been vouched for repeatedly be the Board of Directors and is trusted throughout the Church. Is to the Candidate Department of the Board the best evidence of its attitude is in its acts. It has not recommended the declination or discouragement of a single Princeton Seminary student ble us of Joetrian Conviction. The only specific case which you cite, of the your and recoulty he had been string in the Continuing Trasbyterian Church in Candidate, at the tith no biscourage at his tower. He was a not desirable candidate, and its once an joy ally appointed.

and have experienced the Gospel of the New Testam nt, and he are able nimed to go out to preach by word and life "the glorious Gospel of the blessed Gosmin the fulness of its New Testament meaning. So far from discourating such man, the Board is eagerly seeking for them. And when they are found they are councilled to stand fast in the Scriptural faith and to go forth to proclaim the message of the Gospel in all their life and work a diteaching. You say there is no clar evidence of this. On the other hand I think there is alear evidence in the instructions given in the annual conference with new disciouncies and other ise. For a single example I refer you to Dr. George Alexander's surmon at the Post ar Conference of the Board and all the Missions, entitled, "The Gospel of Paul."

4. You say that your impression of misgiving and distrust is strengthened by the blank which is sent to those whose names the candidate for missionary appointment gives as references, and you single out for criticism from the fifth items of character and equipment which are mentioned these three - "tolerance of the point of view of others," "desire to progress in spiritual truth" and "senity", explained as "absence of tendency to entreme viena." Suraly you cannot seen to imply that these are undesirable qualities in Christian missionaries. There are, to be sure, lim to to toleration, just as to some the revirtues, and it is not always easy to fin those limits. In your book on "The origin of raul's Religion" you carry a a scholar with great urbanity, the lists of tolarce of the point of view of others for beyond the point where may on, would rea of carrying them in cooperation in missionary arvice, but there would be nothing but pure separate individualis, as you have recognized in your books, it we mere not prop relico work together within the even lied rellowship in tol-race of the point of it of others. The question of the blank, at r. Hally pointer out to you, cov re And this Charles Hodre desended and vocate at the e ting of simply that. the Ev.n. elical alilance in me York in 1870 and Dr. Latton ha nobly a to erth in "Fundamental Christianity" an' Dr. E. D. marfield h. aphasized in his dinority Report to the General Assembly of 1928 when, referring to our troubles at Princeton bemin ry, he says, "In my judgment the root and ground of the indication are embodied in personalities, and so for as they are not abouted in personalities, they are embodied in the 1 ck of the tolerance hich - so strongly claim for ourselves The mostion on the reference blank involver and so generally deny to others." no more and nothing different from this - the sbilling of Christian on the hold the evan; lical convictions of our Church to ark tog ther is a rmony and soil and mutual tolerance.

And as to "desire to progress in spiritual truth" - that is on of the clearest admonitions of the lew Testament: "Grow in the graph and knowledge of our bord and aviour less Christ." "Long for the spiritual milk which is without guile that ye may grow thereby unto salvation." "To alk corthily of the Lord unto all planting, pearing truit in every good took, and her a single knowledge of tood." And how many more passages! It is men and somen who long and strive for the sulfilment of these possibilities in their own lives shour antend in Christian service at home and abroad.

and "sanity" meming "a sence of tendency to theme viola" Cartainly the opposite of these qualities is not decirant. No carefully in your books of you guard against certain extreme violable in the millennial hope, regarding extreme intellectualism and a treme of perimentalism, and many mysticism, regarding extreme intellectualism and a treme of perimentalism, and many others! And how earnestly Paul counsel, men: "Let your moderation, your forbearnees be known unto all men." "God give up a spirit of power and love and of a cound mind." "Soberness" is one of his emphasized virtues and exter's, too.

Beyon there are sober and match unto prayer." "The reserving up the loins

of your mind, be sober in set your hope perfectly on the grice that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jos & Christ." This is true sanity, the sanity desired in missionaries. (Cf. Gal. V. 25, II Feter I.")

And note the place of these questions and their relationship to other questions in the blank. "Tolerance of the point of view of others" is part of the eighth general subject. "Team ork qualities." Four are mentioned, as follows: "a. That. b. folerance of the point of view of others. C. Self-control. d. The ibility. (Subordination then best of one or ambitions and preferences.)" The tenth subject of inquiry is "Spiritual qualities" and the subheads are: "a. Christian character. b. Eital religious e.p. rience.

c. Spiritual influence on others." The eleventh subject is "Promise of Development in the Christian life" and the subheads are: "a. Desire to progress in spiritual truth. b. Fagerness for Christian service. c. Sanity. (Absence of tendency to extreme views)." Then follow questions at to the experience of the candidate in various forms of practical work and Christian since.

To twist these simple and reasonable and ise questions and to freight them with suspicion is an untrue and unjust note in your paper.

- 5. You say that in the "Candidate Reference Blank" "there is not one ord to determine the candidates intellectual attainments as over a linst his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the Goupel." That is covered (1) by the constitutional requirements of the Church with regard to the examinations of ord ined confidates by their Presbyteries which are r ported to the Board. (Frequent ctions of the General Assembly have dealt with this matter or the functions of duction Boards and Presbytories in this reg. ... The question is respects the Foreign Board - p. god upon by the Board and by the Ceneral Assembly in 1902 and 1905 when Dr. . . Fraton out Dr. Robert duss 11 Booth and Dr. John Fox, who here then members of the Board, were particularly concerned in the decisions reached, and in 1895, 1917 ... 13.1. (2) By the three justions to hich nort space is liven and which are deemed the most important questions on the "Can limite Reference Blank", namely, "Nould you recommend appointment?" "II not, what would seem to be the ek points or fulls hich in your juigment should issue lify the applicant from foreign mission work?" "unhandered be any usection place st to frankly your own opinion a to the control itness or the control to an the work of a for in missionary?" (3) By the intusion in the Personal application Plank filled out by every lym n n' om an carrie to of the our Constitutional questions propounded by Fresbyteries to ancient for arianties. (4) By the following qualtions: "That is your habit in Sevotional Bitle etudy and prayer?" "Do you believe that in every form of mission ork the par mount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, bord and " cter?" "Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your insionary service, no matter shat special duties may be assimed to you?"
- (5) By requiring from every condidate, ordered and unordained, a separate letter. The requirement is thus expressed on all applie tion blanks:
  - (b) Your Christian development and e perionce: (c) Your otives in seeking mission my appointment; (d) The content of your C ristian Mensage."

as explaining what is involved the colleving st to nt is sent to every candidate

sho is not under care and examination of a ire bytery:

## "The Content of your Christian Message.

This question is vital. You propose to go to a foreign Larlin oracle to propagate the Christian religion, either by public address, or by propagate the Christian religion, either by public address, or by propagate the Christian statements upon the clear idea of what this religion is. Any positive statements upon Christian faith and practice which you wish to aske should be not forth her, and will naturally include your idea of God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Sprit, the redemptive work of Christianity, duties to your follows and, the Bible, the Churchy together with such other leading truths as you could expect to embody in your message. Such condensation is desired a say be consistent with a sitisfactory setting forth of your views."

Possibly you may never have seen this last state nt. It has been in use for the past six years.

In the light of these statements I think your criticism of the blanks is untrue and unjust.

6. You criticize also the question on the application black with regard to the ability of the candidate to "Cheerfully accept and support the decision of a ma ority, even if the decision is contrary to your (his) orn opinions," and you are dissatisfied with fr. Hadley's explanation that this does not refer to theological convictions but to capacity to work with others happily in attending to our main common business and in pursuing our definite and united aim even though there may b. differences of opinion over questions of method and policy and judgment, and oth r Such ability to work with others is certainly important. In the Shentung Mission in China there were three strong per onalites - Dr. Tevius, Dr. lateer and Dr. Corbett. These sen were lide uplant in their opinions as to mission ry policy and method, but they ere able to adjust thems ives and to establish and carry forward one of the best wirsions of our Church. I'r. Hall y was right in interpreting this question in this sense, a raising of the issue of evergelical theological views, which are the expected basis of mi. signary a pointment, but "the q juestion of temperament and ability to ork in fullest hereony ith reple in the small group which is usually found in a distion station."

The juestion on the application blank is an old, old unstion. It has been used for any years; in its present arm for the past seven years. It has never had any reference to theological vic.s. They are covered, as I have pointed out, in other ays.

7. You criticize also the two questions which emphr is. th "paramount duty" and "the chief aim" of each mission my "to make Je s Christ kash as Saviour, Lord and laster." Surely this is just in the Church anto to be a sure of in its for ign missionaries, that every one of them ill set the paritual, everylistic purpose in the first place and, as the Boar's "anual sign, will make "all methods and forms of missionary service contribute to the realization of this aim." I shall refer later to your rejection of this statement to mission my aim but I ould refer here, though I shall refer a aim also to this, to your statement that the use in these usestions of the terms "Saviour", "Lords and "seter" is "atual ally value." That statement is both untrue and unjust. It is the kins of state and regarding your Christian brothern which both the Scripture and the Stand res of our Church forbid. I use the term "Saviour" and "Lords and "Sotors, and my associate suce them

and they are used by the Board in these quections, in the same sense, in the full cense, in the sincere and explicit sense in which they are used in the Go pels. in the Book of Acts, in the Epistles and in the Evvelation - in that go is and in so other. If you think that they are not adequate or that they are "rtudiedly value" your controverey is with the New Testament those meaning and authority in this and in all things I unreservedly accept and the shown very word I am content.

You refer to the fact that on May 8, 1928, "no less than si out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ai isterial members of the Foreign Board "were signers of the Cauburn of irration" and that four of the five in the case of the Foreign Board are still members of the Board and that Mr. Hadley, the present Candidate Secretary of the Board, was also a signer, though at the time he signed he had not become a secretary of the Board. If I were a minister I would not have signed the "Auburn Affirmation." Nor would I sign any other except the great affirmation of our Confession: "The Supreme Judge can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."

I have, however, just re-read the "Affirmation" and note the following positive declarations:

"We affirm and declare our acceptance of the Testminster Confession of Faith, as we did at our ordin tions, 'as containing the system of doctrine tau ht in the Holy Scriptures. 1 we sincerely hold and earnestly preach the doctrines of evangelical Christianity, in a recement with the historic testimony of the Prosbyter an Church in the United States of

America, of which we are loyal sinisters. The war

"We all hold most earnestly to these gre t f ets and doctrines (i.e., the inspiration of the Bible, and the Incarnation, the 'toncment, the Resurrection, and the Continuing Life and Supernatural Forer of our Lora Jesus Christ); we all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God; that Jesus Christ as God manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Him and through Him we have our redemption; that having died for our sins H rare from the dead and is our everlasting Saviour; that in His earthly ministry He wrought many nighty works, and by His vacarious death and unfailing presence He is able to save to the uttermost."

In their positive affirmation surely the entitled to be trusted and believed as you and I think "e are, in if I understand it 11 the positions and principles of Dr. Charles Houge and Dr. Patton there is basis here for righteous Christian cooperation.

The second part of your paper is devoted to my "utterances" as a "cause of disquiot rearring the Foreign Board." And the terms of your letter and the expressed suspicions and implied charges of your statement are a summens to skli-defense. I have been associated ith the ereign mission work of our Church in our Board for thirty-eight years. I have tried to serve faithfully and efficiently and I do not think the service needs to be vincicated to men. There is a Master whom you and I are both trying to " rve n! His judgment is the only judgment which need much concern us, and you and I are both clearly kno n to Him. But one is glad of the opportunity to bear his Christian itness to our glarious Lord and His Gospel and to seek to relieve the foreign l'asion cause, to high long ago I gave my shole life from the suspicions and distrust shiels you think my utt rances have brought upon it.

The chief ground of complaint and criticism in your tatement lith regard to me relates to the little book "ar Poceign Missions Done or?" In it statement of the aims of foreign lissions. Indeed the statement of im is quot i in the book from the Bourd's Manual, where it has statement of integers for any years, I am shall to retire for a time with the little book into the back round and shall take up your att ck on the statement of the mi ionary aim to which also reference we earlier make. The statement hich you criticizes as follows:

"The supreme and controlling if of for it rictions is to make the Lord Jes's Christ khown to all more their Divine S viour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to there the disciples into Christ an chur has which shall be a "f-properating, alf-superting, and self-governing; to cooperate, to long as more sary, with the c churches in the evangulation of their country on and in bring to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

You object to this as "evarive and v. u." on because it do not plicitly "leel re the absolute necessity for v ry all sion ry of h list in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitute orry that a sacrifice to a tisfy divine justic, in His supermeteral return, is the brolut necessity of the new birth as over a list by d v lopent of human of a spin justification by faith about, in only then by the row right recording

In reply I would say: (1) This it is not of the arrest and controlling aim of foreign is long a propert in it proceed orm by a committee or the Post War Conference of the Bourd ith representatives of the Missions held at Princeton in Jone 190). The the reas of this committee ? the a.v. J. salter Lowria, D.D., o. Chira, Los secretary of the Biole Unga of China. It was he ho In lped to form this statement, hier the Couling of unimporty ropts for just that it are intended to be, no core in olar. It not a statement of the Lostrial content of the Gospel mess . It is the brief of possible lockerstion of the central purpose of missions with due subor in tion of it wishous That central purpose must ussur dly is no ...k kapen our Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour of the abla. ( ) The it was the bolut by and faithfully Scriptural. It gathers together the form in thought on the Gr. to Co- incion in its various .orms: "And Jess came and apok unto them, ging, ll po r is given unto me in h wen and carth. Go yo ther are, as' to en also tions, baptizing them in the more of the Fish r and of the Son, and of the Soly Cho t." "And He said unto them, Go y to all the orle, no present the coupel to v ry creature." "And ye hall be itnesses unto " both in Joranalm, and in all Judea, in Smaria, in unto the utt rost part of the eight.

Ill your criticisms of the sime that it is ally splite that the more to, so that to the more to, so that to the more to, so that to the more to, so that the more to have mentioned. They so contain and in the mich you disapprove. Your vist applies to the great to mission a transfer to it.

(3). You cummarile pour criticis, a thing that it is also by sying "In short, there is no hint here that the control is in any head of the control of the co

precious blood of Christ " I think that my fir rd card. Christian minimal find not only a hint of these things but fir one than a hint is the plain, honest morals of the aim of honorably and fir mind thy constraint. The same other elements of the Scapel would be included in a state and of the sessionary is to make known but they do not materally or expentially rall in a sentence estatement of the central and controlling size.

That aim is to make our Saviour and Lord, James Christ, the Son of God known to the world. Paul writes to the Ephesians, "Outo me the self that the lost of all saints was this grave given to proach unto the dentile, the unit rehable riches of Christ." Some of those r ches he proceeds to unrold but by so and all, and he makes no mention of some of the particulars in which, of course, he believed but all of high he never attempted to summarize in any at the attent of his central, sin le missionary purpose.

I think you make three great milities here (1) You contain the state ont of the Lim of Lisions to proclaim the Gospel of Christ lith the statem to I who content of the mass go of the Gospel. (2) You allow your suspicion and distribut of others, your jid ing as you would not be juided, to delive the prior your view. When you call Jesus Christ Lord and laster you say to make as and honostly, but when I call him so, the words are used dishonastly. Thisi, "untrue and unjust." It is more than that. Faul says suplicitly, "To make a say Josus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit." You appear flatly to disput Faul and to believe that men one call Jesus Lord by the evil spirit. Our Lord spoke some so an order lout this kind of judy mt. (3) You unmistakably in My that the failure specifically to cention certain great doctrines in evidence that the factorine are not believe.

The value of high characterizes this atter to (i.e., the state of aim) also characterizes the arole boostet (i.e., the late of the control of the virgin birth of all lars of the bolat of costy of belief in it for every missionary, no relief the bolity means of large attention of the full truthfulnes of peripture (by the late of the large truth of printing at the large truth of britises, no main of justification by lith, a mostion of the large truth of britises, no main of justification by lith, a mostion of the large truth of Christ."

Before stamining this term it in in highle tick this you not into it and the intersect which you may out of it, I is he best my modified remistake bly about. I as an even elical Christian builty. I accept all the facts, it is deciring all the truths of the left towart. I at the my convictions runnarily in an article in the International Review of the international

"Before attemption to ease of the continue tion, the riter of this up of our ht perhaps, in order to work all minutes the in, to the his war point of vie. He recepts the file of the point in the first war. He believes unqualitably every notice of the point of Creak. No language is adequate to that his conception of Christ. He believes that the any cores of every express, the order then he god income to, reconciliant the world to Himself, the only Saviour, or word are our God. He believes in the truthfulness of the reord of Christ line, including his mirecles, as a place with great by in the mirecle of the Virgin Birth and of the real Report of Christ and of the Report of Christ and of the real Report of Christ and the Report of Christ and the Report of Christ and the Report of Christian and the Report of Christian and Christ and the Report of Chr

personal a v nt. He beli ves that it is do alone ho through Christ saves men, not by their that aters, nor by any works of righteousness which they can do, but by his own grace through the doath and life of His dear Son. As to the Bible, he accepts the loctrine of the at inter Confession and regards its anthority approve, not in faith only but also in the practice, con uct as relations of ma. I am afroid this may seem to many vary action to dark unmoder, and the writer must be prepared to accept what ver limit tions of value in the modern and such via a set upon his jud ment as to the doctrinal limit of tolerance in the footrial this of cooperation."

As to our Lord, I spoke fully in definitely in the oderator's a man at the Gener I Ascembly in 1938. I as no theologian in I did not and cannot speak in terms of systematized theology (which I respect and believe to be necessary) but I believe in the Saviour and His glory and His r decing work a deeply in truly and lovin by a your on believe in Him. I tried to say this at the Assembly in Tulsa. These has some of the ords I need:

There is nothing good or great that e will not say about Jesus. There is no claim the tes will not make for Him. There is man that t. .t we can sy i' ut God that we will not say also about Jesus, the Son of Mis love; in hom e have our redemption, the for isomess of our line: ho is the image of the invisible Go., the first bore or all creation; for in His were all thin; or ded, i. be in ters and won the arth, tain a visible and thin invisible, hather throner or dominions or principalities or powers; all thin have been created through Him, an unto Him; and He is bove all thin ., and in Him all chings concict. and He is the '. : or the body the Church; who is the beginnin , the isstborn from the deal; that in all thin : He is ht have to pressinence. or it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dell; an through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having a de pe ce through the blood of his cross; through Him, I say, whether thin s upon the earth, or thin,s ir the he vens.

aid and then so will say that Ho i on the him. all
that an all say that Ho i on the him. all
that an all say that Ho i on the him. all
that an all said or ver carry about Hi. long, His beauty,
His power, Hi deity e ill is he is all this and He
transcends all this. Here let us stands ab for himself and
all of us as Christ's Church a henceforth lat no man trouble us for
a bear in our mind an is our heart, in our spirit ad la our lody
the arks of the hor? Jesus."

"But all orice Il slort or oh re lity ith reard

to Christ. I. We were nothing but a od od man he spoke and trought as is by as He anew log ago in Palestine, who died browely on a Gross with no hate of those who did such hate all arong, and over whose undisturbed grave the Syrian at rollook lows, then we should have much scruple lest to should rong His memory with excess speech. Indeed lows, a should have found the ademate words to describe His humanity. But to us Jesus Christ is not a good lead man but God, the living God, our Risen and biving Caviour, and we will use all the language we have and does it simple and poor to utter the oner that is beyond all uttermee.

"Nevertheless to our like our to uncion. To confess him in the august symbols of our historic creeds and confessions."

You may not call these "value and evalue" or it. You is not call them, as you do call the sincere and sarmest utt rances of our mission of mile of the secretaries of our Board, "pertunctory lip ser ice." It you do, you will have to an or before our bord and Judge; may jour all receive eval now in your mind and char other Golfs in with the penalty upon such un-Christia, and un-Christlike judgment of a on an his fellow Christia. Let us both be mindful of our matter to reas. (".tt. VII. 1-4).

No let us eva ine this present criticis. (1) You may that y light work does not as theon the Virgin Birth a lit plan in Christian That is true. "Alther is it mentione' i your 'ook or "Th. Origin of Faul's Relition." You here at orth th catally of Jos at life which we know to rull but you ada no reasion wor the wire Wirgin Tirth. The . In , le . ention of it is your book " . hat is Ruith?" is in the aution which is a ked in a purely incidental and secondary ay, with the it (i.e. simple trust like that or the Concurrion) to do ith . queroism of fact like the question of the Virgin birth?" ( . 01, . You go on on this same p go to state hat . note to kno whout Jesus. do not leation the Virgin Birth. Those two books are serious and competent theological studies. On light expect to in lale rention in them, especially in a liscursion of " hat is Trith?" of all that the writer decided end notal. You omit the Vir in Birth in these study sof the content of I al's Gorpel and of the Christie faith in then concern myy poor litule boollot on our forcing insion uty because I do not mention . truth high I had no occasion to mation here but which I soy ully believe and have set orth elsewhere togretter bon the adparticularity than I have sen or he re of in any witin so your .

And the you prepared to condern overy book that does not a tairth the Vir in Birth of our Lord and or absolute in cost type of blief in it for all christian preachers as teachers? From I than has sittle and the book on "Fundamental Christianity." Oursely he will do it in the Virgin Birth as a you're wire. Does her that mass, we have that they is the

does be mention it

mention of the Virgin Mary and the Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. In Dr. A.A. Hodge's "Popular Lectures on Theological Thomes there is, if I am not mistaken, a single reference to the Virgin Mary and not a word about the theological significance of the Virgin Birth. Even in the three great volumes of Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology" the index does not mention "Virgin Birth." It refers only to Roman ideas of the Virgin Mary. And in the text the fact and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth receive almost no attention. Under "Particular Passages which teach the Pivinity of Christ" no reference is made to the Virgin Birth. nder the Person of Christ there are a few references to it, chiefly re-, lating to the human nature in Jesus and the substance of His body. There is no reference whatever to the place of the Virgin Birth in the Christian message nor any such treatment of its theological significance as one finds, for example, in Du Bose's "Soteriology of the N " Testament."

Do not misunderstand me. I believe in the Virgin Birth and I regard it, in Dr. George Alexander's words, as "a peculiarly pracious truth. \* And I know that of course Dr. Patton believes it. But the idea that failure to mention it implies disbelief and that ever bookwhich omits it is unevangelical is untrue and irrational. Consider the result of the application of your requirements here to the volume entitled "Biblical and Theological Studies by the Faculty of Frinceton of the Founding of the Seminary" (1912). It is a great volume Here, surely, one would feel that he had a right to expect a full statement of the Gospel which the Seminary was established to teach, presentation of the essential and fundamental teaching of Christianity, setting forth with special clearness the Christian message Dr. Patton in his opening paper says, "My for our time. theme embraces the entire circle of theological learning." Your criticism of our statement of aim is that it is not enough to speak of the circle: all the contents of the circle murt be explicitly spoken of also, and you name certain contents whose vernal omission is proof of unevangelicalism and of a vague and evasive insincerity. Well, let us see. and sincere theological volume contains not a single reference to the Virgin Birth. The one reference to the Second Coming of Christ is in a paper by Dr. Erdman. That is the only one. There is a paper on "Sin and Grace in the Koran" but none on "Sin and Grace in the Cospel." The is a "Study of Jonathan Edwards" and another of "The Aramaic of Daniel" and another of "The Shepherd of Hermas" but none of "the truthfulness of the Scriptures", of "the new birth of believers" of "justification by faith", of "the atoning death of Christ." What if one should use your own words: "What sort of a Gospel is it from which all that makes a Gospel has thus been left out? In this vague massage the offence of the Cross is done away but so is the glory and the power." These words might far more justly be used here than with regard to my little missionary book. This is a great theological presentation of the Gospel offered in commemoration of a century's life of a great school

whose business it is to set forth the cont at p. the Go.p.l. But I will not use your words. I think the volume is a worthy Christian production and one of the best things in it is the pessage in your paper, here, more dequately than any where else, you recognise (p.575) the Paulia doctrine of the desurrection. And I think its omicsions are justified on the ground on which you justify omissions in Paul's spistles, namely, "It is omitted not because it is unimportant but on the contrary because it is fundamental" (p.562). I think that is a valid justification of the se "Diblical and Theological Studies" alth their vast on a done. I think it is valid in the case of rany one slows in your books. "Ill you not be equally fair-minded toward others?

- (2) You say there is "so mention of the bodily resurrection" in my little book. The Resurrection is mentione more than once and by the I mean the bodily Resurrection of our Lord, but I did not use the phrase. Neither have you used it in a simple one of your three books which I have read and it is not used in the sew Testament? The New Testament is content to speak of the Resurrection, meaning the real and cetual Resurrection of our Lord and I am content with the language of the New Testament. And is to the reality of the bodily Resurrection of our Lord I hol? Ith Taul that it is the supreme fact and truth in Christianity.
- (3) You may there is "no mention of the full truthculances of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all)." Lain you as mistaken. The Lible, the "rest int, the "ord of God are all mention directedly. The full truthfulness of ceripture is everywhere issumed. I ace pt joyfully, "a specific ech missionary to accept, the doctrine of our Stan's ds of the reger to the crip tures. But I must honestly say that there is exacthing which appears to be not alto ether candid, I will not any "evaluation", it your not a renew the inspiration of the Scriptures. One notes the care lither alth you refer a from facing certain issues and from using the language of or not those hom you also to think that you agree with them. and do you or do on not a receith Dr. I thom's position in "Fundamental Christianity."?
- (4) You say there is no ention of the unconstruction of Christ.

  Fro of your three books make no ention of it. I find on tion of it in ...

  iodae's "Popular Lectures." As for no I by cheris's this with an hop for forty two years. 'y boyhood mini ters, graduate of T inceten Deminary and the orthodox of the orthodox, spiritualized this truth co plately out of the Bible but I learned it at the "orthfield Contare of the I a Sophomore in college of I have lived with it and it it or since has I also born some reproach because it. I note a little book on it in the in the preschedit. I think I have born tentimes the line to it rich you have borne. But it did not seem to be necessary to introduce it into this little decree of minimal into the little dec
- (5) You say there is "no ention of the coirth of liever, and no mention of untification by fuith, no mention of the Crucified and ever-living Lord." That this by recognizing "one bare mention of the Crucified and ever-living Lord." That would you think of the pirit of the tement the charmas "one bare ention of the Virgin Pirth" and "one bare ention of relation" in "that is Frith?" But again you are mistaken. Those truths are either state or implied or assumed in my booklet. One than this are not called or in the neture on purpose of the little book. It

sas not in ittempt to set forth the cold at a the Christian . It simply a short and extract presentation of the claim that Christian the bully is the sufficient Saviour.

The claims of Christ are not k pt in the tackground. The little book is full of their ascertion. It mintains, the on hout, the old one is acy and universality of the Goopel: "Christ needs withing from . w . . . o other religious to scher has any contribution to a k to Him. In Him 11 ll to the of the Gosheri. He is the find and sufficient reveletion of Son . I the only wiour and sedemor of mas. This is the North Star at right white. It is the solid and was literable coundation of forcing incomes - For it, in time are not a search for a mental better r ligion. They are not an attempt to find mething that is not alrest in Christ. They are the court of those he we heard of Christ to take that they have heard to the hole orle in orear that all con to there ay 1. In more of Him." (p.SS) It conceives Christ, the Scripture to, with unconscious Derive of the Astinas, the one of the red all the problem of the sul of an, his one S . jour ad his only hope. & Just counted to viction for our Church L. the work at home and abroad is this conviction that it has in this talk callied at Gos, el. The Church is not looking for a new orleans the int. It has some the one an only Saviour." "The Christies fith is a truth and a truck grat r than my other that a possess. It is our cuty to share it am to pp il to il ion everywhere to take it as their own. It is theirs by the same title that makes it ours and there are depths in it shich all only or found a semplore them together apprehending with all . into, as along so ca, the fall dimen ion of the low of Go . and all attaining, ... the only my in which my or un our attain, the unity of the faith and the stature of the rulness of Christ. The truth that and took pin view and that it is easy to forget is that Christ is a cor than all our thou his about Him no that a, the hole orld comes to know Mis and to empt dis born hip new clories hithorto not seen in Him will appear. But these glories are in Christ. They renot in the religions or rustill cultures of acid. Latte revel tion of Lea will not come from those religion or culture. It ill on from Christ is the result of a linger belief by markind in Him in a linger application of Him prece and po er to human life throughout the world. This is the la con the ment to remanber, bur ile a bout Christ may be true or a they on, but they and rot to for "e may not hold that they are complete. But Christ is complete. In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godh & hottly." (p. M.). "Thri ti bolute and final 11 Ho and His religion to proveil absolutely to finally". "It is thrist that we Christians over to all man here we' throughout the orly. It this position b r gardet as nurrow and function, then a much user; t such confern that. They are recurred to the come good ment must sply to the hole doctrin on the fistanget. The foreign middle some opplier range with remarkable aparticity this view of the uniquenes, and sufficiency of Christ. The early Church bill ved that there sur now other : unc given and, an ah c by th y as t bo av i. 11 ten everythere nucleo Christ and Christ and chough. Tither Gr k, for north, for Semitic religion had any correction to the or are supples at to all to Mis. the bern foreign similar enterprise at new or the am ground. It is the end, wor to make Christ known to all mankind, that all markind to ther may live in Him and find in Rim tore and or ter tro was that my on rice or my one bull an ital alone. Fich rice and each soul for itself our ing in Mis all that it know that it needs, but only marking altograther will discern the well apon of how need the infinite fulness of hrist's supply. H is about to inter to the full a data of a ch soul only too use He is the whole world's tuffici at Savigar:

In Him is live provided or all mankind and m . !

"I would rejoice to see the missionary interprise brought in our day more of only and loyally and uncomplainingly than ever to the fore a otal id . Aith high it began, and to see it disentangled, as far as em signatural it, from the many of the compromising rellosships in which it fin . its li, and rele . I to to its pure, clementary, rational work down at the foundations of human 15. i. r lating men one by one to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour." (p. 1 ) "I rat that a man's judgment here will depend altogether on which his entirety in or Jerus Christ, Il Jesus Christ mans nothin, to him, by he all not a very metalty on the part of other men for knowing about him. But is assu, Cari t is all there is for us, if we know that He is all there is, then a comot but a gight the inherent obligation in wealth like that to be that I it all the have stypt come into its possession." (p. 1.8) "The missionary enterprise in the proclassition of the One Rame given under Houven Laur Ton there yere must be say to and there is nothing in any non-Christian rall ion to be and to the glory of Christ or to the fulness of the revolution of Christ, howblit we so imperfectly appeared it still. Inside the Christian spirit burn the old resolution that glo in ot. Paul's heart to whom it would have been too!, if he had not there the Christ he knew. "Tould that se might get back a, in to the for is missionary and roris in the pure, maked spiritual reality of it, as Christ cll of the hillich report men and wolum around Him at the first, she had no a tip back of them, the are not join to speak for any rice. They or just a little group is i dividuals who Christ had ride even of the kneet thair . decorr. . He toll them to nout an here he's they had in Him ith all the orle. Theo is that the medicarry ent rprice has always been. That is that it is to y - "hristia sty stripe" of all ace works and secondary account on at, for Christ, Him has be a lor a to the whole world for which Bo Had." (p. 141).

These are only a row corression from this little book. It is a por little thing but it is not the value in evalue in an value little thing you like. While this poullies were and on a should have been about the book you are the only one of whom I have been the condemns it. For of the law, it and not grateful of the letter of communication is from a all friend, for albertus Pieters, of Holland, which in, concern we have the law the law that the little book has forthise as a like I conviction as so iros that also are several as so are several as a lour than you:

"I have just rimished the region of your book, so kirlly sent to me, entitled fore Foreign designs flow of." It is now a term to slow, F.A. I commot a provide the joy I received in region it. If the leving much of my some zeal for missions dampened by regard post or for the to in the Daiv reity of a set the coldness, or the church that I have tried to intermed in a second term, I now rededicate myself or to the tak of mission and regions to do my best to give and stimulate living in the little church I was called to error.

"I can fully approved to the diff react but the 'The religion of the good diving So. ""

In the Cay that year little book the or in Missione for For? came to us, I red it are small to write you to be in right to further distribution of it. I probably a little you keep ture as business, but in the light of for coller primited right relivations my first impulse the right.

"I would like to have the hole thin, or perhap only the chapt r

'Christ is Fnough' printed for las \_\_ tr'untion mong our coller organizations."

"The more I row this volume the I am improved the its value an' importance, combajous cially at this time. It is the ablest defense or justification of foreign is not that he yet been sent forth. It will be sure to strength a thorough and in over those he are hostil or he are luke are indifferent. The great Host of the Church must have not it into your heart to write it and I am sure will use it in tarriage the whole Church up to a renewed sense of its are tresponsibility. In regard to the whole matter."

reading your recent book! t, 'Ar for ign 'i sions Done lor?' I cannot refr in from writing. I and to thank you with all my heart for the stand and the mer. Los in that booklet. Turn mentally, this defending the foreign minimum move and the call back to the original madde of for 1, at the I could myself in couplete present 4th very page of the bak."

"I have just roll' reloright for. Don ar?" at or itticand I can't reliat sayin, he sayer all it is. To my mind it to the most unanswormble around I have verse. I to hope someboly is giving it wide circulation. There is too such local talk going about, even among people she knows better, about our rigide completing or complementing another. You are right, Christianity as are so complete title conclusion - it needs discovery."

"Reading this wonderful little book of your I feel envise?" that you still stand firm on the old reliable with one. " liver?" unto the baints."

This last is from the "Church of the Lather a Brother a." I washing to her quot d three. I done to use real's order al ad b compact his property of the compact has a

There is much more in your at the it which shoul be rivi er, but I have written quite enough and more than ou, ht to have been re wired. I could in er some of your criticism, by quoting ire your we book, the state at of the very truthe for which you condemn as . The cot to thing work a hich I shall or ak. (1) The street i this. I i myo lait doep in thankful cford the almost all of your great conviction. I as full of a iretion as gratitude for "The set in of rand's aclided" and religion in the year opposite on the his bricity of approaturalness of the late of Christian tyle both lang and the necessity of the rest Christian petral unitional rom the fact, m the need of reasoned doctrinal statement and and on the great Setrice. of the colosith, on the For on of Christ, on it the, a Christinity of me. re . Il san e perione and liv, . I malit to ith the long list of all by .very lie lemviction. h. I i. r r you I t th points here, as it so as to as, you die refronte accepture. I'm grat Scripture touths you i or or quality. You tit or i t rpr t . 30 pasout on their plain and obvious to the stance of a unit - eriptur 1, ever

anti-Scriptural forms of thought and expression. Ther apparently contradictory ideas or statements are lound in the New Test ment you wollfy one or the other or both to fit your scheme of thought instead of accepting them both just as they are without qualitication as parts of la r truth or like smich corpr bonds them both without any minimization. You do no justice to Paul's moral and social applications of the Gospel and you even indulge in a fling at ter sinfeters who read the sixth chapter of Ephesians to their people. There are illustrations in your paper which we are considering. There you ase some or's in your statement of essential doctrine which are not ound in the Scriptures tell. I can state my convictions sholly in the very words of the Scriptures. You use repeatedly the phrase "the gospel of the Gross". This phrase is not in the Scriptures. The New Testament knows "the Gospel", "the Gospel of Christ", "the Cospel of the Kingdom", "the Gespel of peace," "the Good of God, " "the everlacting Goapel", but it nowhere uses the phrase "the Gospel of the tross" and the use which you make o' that phrase implies interpretations both of the idea of the "Gorpel" and of the idea of the Cross which do not do ; stice to the full .em Testament The Cospel is not the Cospel of the Cross only, not even of the Cross of Christ only. The Gospel is the Gospel of Christ which incluses the Cross and what preceded the Gross and what ollowed the Cross. The same defect marks your use of the idea of "calvation only b the Cross," and your criticism of my reference to the "redeeming life" of Christ. Your view certainly Joss not do full justice to the Scriptures nor does it represent the true Scriptural proportion of truth. You say in "th ti faith?" "Christ bouches our lives, according to the New Testiment through the Cross." (p. 143 But compare Heb. II,18; IV., 15,16.) "The Gross of Christ is the special besis of Christin faith". (p.144-But compare I. Cor. WV. 17). "The Gross by shich salvation als mought." (your statement; But compare Rom. I. 14, V. 17). I'm do not and cannot too such on it the Cross of Christ, but you can wa you do fail to set it in its Scriptural place and relationship and you me lock to rel to it requitely to the full truth of the You do not give their full Scriptural place to the Incaraction prior to the Cross or to the Resure et on any many other appets of the full truth o. the Gospel. You justly emph.clae the last of the Accurrection and its evidential signi is now but you do not forwately set forth its relation to the redoming work of Christ, its place in mer division, or its practical and dynamic significance in the live of the believer as the New Testament sets forth all those aspects. You do indeed in brief ref reaces cough the Cross and the Resurrection in their rel time to salvation. In "hat is Paith?" you speak of "the Gospel of redemption through the Cross of resurrection of Christ" (p.p. 154,151). Also "The Origin of Paul's selicio ," p. 157. In vic. of your criticism of my use once of the more "Spirit" with a small "s", or notes that you habitually write "Cross" an 'I to, though not e rli r, Vir in Birth with a capital and the "resurrection" without It.) But you criticize my truly Scriptural reference to the "redeeming like" of Christ (Rom. VI.,1-11; VII,4; VIII:1-14)

The New Testam at the ching is in righer at freer than your view appoints to be. It to ches not that the Cross sives us or that so are along the Cross. It to ches that Christ saves us, and that He alves us by Miscle, the Cross and by His lie. How right to Paul's orient tion and proportion by Miscouth and by His lie. How right to read us, in that, while we of these truths! "But God commendeth his love to ard us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much are then, bein now ustified by were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much are then, bein now ustified by his blood, we shall a saved from what through Miss. For i, then we were energies, we have reconciled to God by the death of his Son, and mare, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his lie. and not only an but he also by in God through our Lard Jes a Christ, by whom we have now received the atomer at."

(Now. V., S-11). Let any one take his New Yest much mid me it through,

marking every reference to the Cross and the deute o. Christ and every reference to the Resurrection and the life of Christ and compare the result with the proportions of these glorious for s and doctrines in your emphasis. "Christ died .or our sins" you quote often and you cannot made too often. But only occasionally do you add "ac ordin; to the Scriptures " an still less frequently to you complete the quotation and add "And He bath seen raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." Of cou se you believe this and rejuice in it, but you do not relate these truths as Paul does and you substitute the Cror which might bave been without the Resurrection for the plan of the Resurrection with included the Cross. The Cross without the Resurrection would not have to ed us. Paul proceeds in this very chapter to declare is language high the sour breath away: "If Christ hath not been raised, your fai h is Vain, re ar yet in your And one me ht to on to speak of Pat rin teaching of sins" (I. Cor. IV. 17) the relation of the nesurrection to regeneration an salvation. This full Gospel of the New Testament is the lociour despel. I do not where your view that it can only be preached of fensively. The Cross is indeed to many a stumbling block . Paul and Peter both realized and declared this. Paul also said: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the dentiles, not to the church of God. Even as I please all an in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye imitahors or me, even as I am of Christ. Givin no of ence in anything, that the ministry But have renounced the hadden things of dishonesty, not walkin; in craftiness, no bandling the or or Go' deceitfully; but by canifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the cight There is clearly in Paul's view a v st did er nee between the preaching of the offence of the Cross and the offen ive preaching of the Cross. The word for "offence" which Paul uses in Gal. V. 11 and I. Cor. IL., 23 and which Peter uses in I. Peter II., 8 is the wany sume high Faul uses in Rome. VIV., 15 and IVI., 17, and which the Saviour uses in His dre dful marriag in Luke /VII.1.2. and which in the American Standard Revised is translated in all to to pissues not "offence" or "of end", but "stumbling block" or "cause to stumble." ere well is we remembered these ford in our Christian fellowship within and in our proclemation of Christ and Hir Gospel to those . o re ithout: "Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but the oriences will come: but moe unto him, through show they come! It were b ther for him that a millstone ere hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sou, than that he should offerd one of . these little ones." "Let us not ther fore judge one canther say o e: but judge this rather, that to has put a stumbling block or an occ sing to hall in hi brother! way." I know that is the parallel passage in I thew the words "little ones" are followed by the ords "that believe in "c," but sarely the Spirit of Christ would not have us think that the Tender Shepherd of His little ones, . To lest the minety in line sile sheep in the lol to bunt the one thit wir lost. rould be pleased with the thought that His disciples should sum a their fidelity by their success in "of ending", in "causin' to stamble" the fert that are out or the way.

And a great deal more might be said of the tailure of your books to set forth "the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God," to use your own phr e. But I do not suspect or reproach you as heretical or unevangelical. I believe that God and the Gospel and its trace are supernatural and in inite and in they are, while we may know they arely and truly, we may know, as Paul himself says, only in part. But a are Christ's true disciples none the lose, and we ought to love one another and walk together "conforted e. h of us by the other" a faith", are making up each of us that is lacking in the other.

Ferhaps you will be tempted to disciss what I have just been saying an the simple, unsophisticated talk of one the is unach oled in the ological entroversy. It is even so. I do not pretend to be anything but a simple, Bible—Christian who holds that under the gread liberty of our Confession he is free to believe all that he linds in the Scriptures to it would there and varied truth of the Scriptures. If he sything that I may be not easier there is a variance with the Scriptures, if it I makes shot the scriptures do not truly declare, or fails to declare shot the Scriptures do truly declare, or fails to declare shot the Scriptures do truly declare. I shall be glad to have it show and shall rejeicially be very great for the truth. Is this not evangelical?

And now listly, you say "Thet I the real impact of our core in Board upon the world? Is it the peraching of Christ crucified - not in some pale modern sense not a a thing upo. I'm now light is thed by the doubt of soldiers in the ar, but a m blacked mystery revealed in the Tori of God? it is, then we can support that Boardin I do not like the sharring refer coto the light which the s critice of line by the may halp us to the in the divine fulness of the searing of the coath of thrist. But your que tien can be enewered with an enewer absolutely flat and al r. I tak you to rold Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Court nee of the Burd and the Missions in 191; on "The Goopel of Paul." There the Goopel is described which the Board exists to .preid .broad. The sardige Board of iste ond its missioneries are appointed and maintained for one supreme surpose, namely, to proclaim to the world the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Incaracte, Trucified, Micke, Ally for Persone, the Sinless One, the only Saviour, who is the bloom of any only Potentiate, the King of kin's and Lord of lords, who only hath importality, dealling in light mapproachable; whom no an hath seen nor can one; to the be tonor and pover eternal. Amen."

I said at the unset that I would speak dinally of your paper as a whole. Ferhaps, however, it is harely necessary to do this copt to may that the particular items of evidence which you have presented as in all ying jour nagative answer to the query "Can vangelie 1 Christians support our Foreign Bouri?" appear to me to be inadequate it., in I have boutht to show, so uniounded, that one woncers how just and brotherly Christi : vic could have rested apor them so it we in injuly and so ray a proposil as the entiblishment of a rivil forci a missionary tracy in our Church, independent of the General Accembly and supported by members of our Church sho proclim their follow members to be unevergelical. and you rost this inquiry and this proposal on unserrented impressions regarding the questions on the "Ref rence Blank", a few thoroughly sensible and right letters from ir. Harley in explantion, scriticism of a Seri tural st tempent of our siesistary sin, a Few rulion and detached quotations from things that I have ritte, a many of your or suspicions, and arguments from the wees which your and books sould not hear. The utbrenes which you have on not we, I blive, both true and Scriptural but you dight have upara, if you had rill or keen, a great act of st tenats in with the cook this you could not elect. s you have manused those in your paper. I was like you, corole to scholarshi, could not live his time to a le meh ampl week a mire, but thy ar loyal books, and their tracking has courbt to be I dithful to our Divine Lord : .. His bord.

The part, it col, it that I have a light on the cold to let the cold to care stly trust that hat I have a light on the cold to care stly trust that hat I have a light to be a row by a lightally in our grant trust as the most Christian population to a local that it is the fall of the care of dod." I have a local to be considered as the care of dod." I have a local to social state who, in sin at inflicitly, in impressed to the care of falls and like in the Church but I the application of the light of the ligh

and now one more quotation from the type how the area of the this proper is of division to the interest and its oak, but in the closing pure a phony were book "chainting the Literalis."

"Is there no real from strict? It is not an all real from the both of lift? It is not only or there end at the influence of the control of the control of the control of the part of the p

Beyond that there say in empty tomb. I discuss bitving bor. While it is the fixeness of the Dervin, well so not deal with it. It is the fixeness of the Dervin, well so not deal with it. It is the fixeness of the likeness of the are come. It is the fixeness of the likeness of the are come. It is the derent results of the last of the derent results of the last of the derent results of the last of the

If the Line wilt to send to send to send to you will think that it is your tary to publish your or r, and y it is only in release that y are r had be published with it. If the on I marked to me to y properties to here at the reason But, y and reason to me to the reason that y are also that it is a result of the reason that it is a result of the reason that the rea

Very with Thy our,

April 30, 1929

Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Box A., Princeton Row Jersey

My dear Dr. Machen:

I have already acknowledged the receipt of your letter of April 12, 1929, with your accompanying paper entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" which you asked me to examine and criticise in order that if it contained anything "untrue or unjust" you might correct it. You courte-ously added that you would be grateful for any assistance that I might render to this end. I am very glad to respond and to try to help you to an affirmative answer to the question in your paper. I believe that my own Christian convictions are not less evangelical than yours, and I believe that our foreign missionary work and workers are also truly evangelical. If I were not convinced of both of these things I should not be associated with our Foreign Board or with the Presbyterian Church. And I use the word evangelical, as will appear, in its plain and honest sense of fidelity to the full Scriptural warrant and content of the Gospel.

I will try first to indicate particular points in your paper which appear to me to be "untrue or unjust" and then I shall speak of the paper as a whole.

1. Your contrast and implied antagonism between the "humanitarian service" of the Board and "propagating the Coapel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole word of God" appears to me to be unjust and untrue and un-Scriptural. It is of course possible to divide the first from the second but not the second from the first. The Gospel includes human service. The New Testament is full of that principle. It insists on such service as one of the evidences and fruits of fidelity to the Gospel. Furthermore, it is by the expression of the Cospel in deeds as well as in words that the Gospel was preached and is ever to be preached. Indeed, in many languages there were no words which had the significance of the English or Greek words embodying the truths of the Cospel and in these languages old words had to be taken and given a new content by life, as the Incornation and its interpretation did at the beginning. It is true that our Board is carrying on a great body of human service and any one who is desirous of doing such work can not find any better opportunity for it than here, but our Board has always made it perfectly clear that in our policy all philanthropic work is tributary to and associated with the primary aim of evangelization. I have expressed my own convictions on this point again and again. One quotation from "Missionary Principles and Practice" (1902) will suffice: "In all use of philanthropic effort, such as medical missions, relief work, etc., as a method of mission work, the dominant and determining aim must

be evangelistic. Such work is useful as securing friendship, removing prejudice, representing the helpful, unselfish spirit of Christianity, contributing to the preaching of Christ, and the revelation of Him as Saviour and Lord, the source of all life and hope, and as relieving suffering; but it is not the responsibility of the foreign missionary enterprise to care for the sickness and suffering of the Times of critical need may occur, as in great famines and pestilence. when a broad liberty of action must be recognized; but in general, the aim of our philanthropic work should be to contribute directly to the preaching of the Cospel. the establishment of the Christian Church, and to the fostering of that Christian spirit which will provide, through the native Church which is growing up and through the people themselves, the salutary fruits of Christianity in philanthropic and humanitarian effort. As a missionary method, philanthropic work should ordinarily be limited, therefore, by the possibility of its evangelistic utilization and A small development of such work contributing powerfully in the direction indicated is better than a large development of but feeble or indirect evangelistic influence. I think it is an error in your paper and in all your books that you do not adequately recognize and set forth the full destrine of the Scriptures, namely, that the Cospel is to be preached not by word only but also and not less, or less fundamentally, by deeds of love and mercy. And thus preached by word and deed by our Presbyterian Church's Missions true fruitage has followed. Converts have been won and churches have been established as numerous and of as true New Testament character as have resulted from the work of any other missions. You are invited to make any comparison you please, including the undenominational Missions which you have sometimes praised for what you regarded as their superior doctrinal fidelity.

2. It is not for me to presume to defend the General Assembly and the Church at large against your expressions of distrust or your intimations that the Church and the Assembly are not really evangelical. I believe that our Church is evangelical. I wish with you that it were better instructed in the doctrine and more animated by the Spirit of the Gospel, but I believe that it is officially and really a truly evangelical Church and I believe, too, that the Foreign Board has not lost its confidence. There are, of course, individuals, like yourself, who feel and express distrust, but I believe you and they are mistaken in this and that the Church is warmly and evangelically loyal both to the Gospel and to the Board and the cause which it represents.

Ferhaps I should say a word regarding the footnote referring to the General Assembly in 1927 when, against my reluctance and protest, I was made moderator. As to my action in connection with Judicial Case No. 1, I erred in unwittingly failing to note and to prevent the voting of numbers of New York Synod on either side of the question, to the extent to which any of them did vote. These were not, however, the only votes illegally cast. And there were other and graver errors antecedent to these for which I was not responsible and which I could not prevent. For the good and honor of the Church it is better to pass them over, but if this matter is to be brought forward the whole story should be unflinchingly told. I candidly summarized the situation at the meeting of the Assembly the following morning, and the Assembly unanimously sustained my position.

I note your depreciation of the worth of any endorsement of the Foreign Board by the General Assembly but perhaps you would think more kindly of the resolutions of the Assembly at Grand Rapids in 1924 adopted on recommendation of the Standing Committee on Foreign Hissions, of which Dr. MacLennan was

Chairman and Dr. Robert Dick Wilson was a member, with regard to union and cooperative enterprises, the selection of missionary candidates, the use of schools and hospitals, and the proclamation of the Gospel which, however, the Committee did not feel bound to describe and define. These were four of the resolutions:

That while maintaining loyally the policy established by past General Assemblies in repeated enactments with regard to cooperation with other Evangelical bodies in our Foreign Missionary Work the Board be directed to exercise due care with regard to the Evangelical character of all such union and cooperative enterprises, and if there should arise in the work of these enterprises a situation in which teachings unsound or injurious to the Evangelical Faith are given, the Board, as it has declared to be its policy, should either secure the correction of such a situation or failing such withdraw from further participation.

"That the Board be commanded for its care in the selection and appointment of Candidates for the Foreign Field, and that they be requested to continue to exercise the most scrupulous care in this regard.

"That we rejoice in all the courage in which in home and Church, is hespital and school, by word and by the printed page, Christ has been preached to men, and we assure the Missionaries and native Churches of our hope and prayer that the program of simple and direct Evangelism may be so increased that the Gospel may be carried to all the people for whose evangelization we are responsible.

"That in this hour when the world's need of Christ is so manifest and desperate, when the opportunities are so great, and new doors of entrance are opened into lands like Afghanistan, which have been hitherto closed, when young men and women are offering themselves freely for service, when our Missionaries and Churches with which they are uniting are eager for a great advance, when the problems of men and of nations and of races cry out, consciously or unconsciously, for Christ as their only solution, when the experience of the past year has revealed anew to the Church the adequate resources which are available to faith and love through the grace of God, this Assembly here and now dedicates itself and calls upon the Church to consecrate herself afresh to a new obedience to the last command of our glorified Lord and to a full acceptance of His Leadership in the supreme task of making the Go spel known to all mankind and of establishing His Kingdom over all the earth."

3. You describe the impression which you say is made upon the minds of Princeton Seminary students by their conferences with representatives of our Poreign Board. The two representatives of our Board with whom the students have most contact are members of the faculty of Princeton Seminary and the full evangelical loyalty of their personal convictions has, I think, not been questioned. It has on the other hand been vouched for repeatedly by the Board of Birectors and is trusted through out the Church. As to the Candidate Department of the Board the best evidence of its attitude is in its acts. It has not recommended the declination or discouragement of a single Princeton Seminary student because of doctrinal convictions. The only specific case which you cite, of the young man recently who had been working in the Continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada, met with no discouragement whatever. He was a most desirable candidate, and was at once and joyfully appointed.

The men wanted for foreign missions are men who firmly believe and who know and have experienced the Coupel of the New Testament, and who are able and ready to go out to preach by word and life "the glerious Cospel of the blessed God" in the fulness of its New Testament meaning. So far from discouraging such men, the Board is eagerly seeking for them. And when they are found they are counselled to stand fast in the Scriptural faith and to go forth to proclaim the message of the Cospel in all their life and work and teaching. You say there is no clear evidence of this. On the other hand I think there is clear evidence in the instructions given in the annual conference with new missionaries and otherwise. For a single example I refer you to Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Fost War Conference of the Board and all the Missions, entitled, "The Cospel of Paul."

4. You say that your impression of misgiving and distrust is strengthened by the blank which is sent to those whose names the candidate for missionary appointment kives as references, and you single out for criticism from the fifth items of character and equipment which are mentioned these three - "tolerance of the point of view of others," "desire to progress in spiritual truth" and "sanity", explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views." Surely you cannot mean to imply that these are undesirable qualities in Christian missionaries. There are. to be sure, limits to teleration, just as to some other virtues, and it is not always easy to fix these limits. in your book on "The Origin of Paul's Religion" you carry as a scholar with great urbanity, the limits of telerance of the point of view of others far beyond the point where any one would dream of carrying them in cooperation in missionary service, but there would be nothing but pure separate individualism, as you have recognised in your books, if we were not prepared to work together within the evangelical fellowship in tolerance of the point of view of others. The question of the blank, as Mr. Hadley pointed out to you, covers simply that. And this Charles Hodge defended and advocated at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York in 1875 and Dr. Patton has nobly set forth in "Fundamental Christianity" and Dr. E. D. Warfield has emphasized in his Minority Report to the General Assembly of 1928 when, referring to our troubles at Princeton Seminary, he says, "In my judgment the root and ground of the difficulties are embodied in personalities, and so far as they are not embodied in personalities, they are embodied in the lack of that telerance which we so strongly claim for ourselves and so generally deny to others." The question on the reference blank involves no more and nothing different from this - the ability of Christian men who hold the evangelical convictions of our Church to work together in harmony and good will and mutual tolerance.

And as to "desire to progress in spiritual truth" - that is one of the clearest admonitions of the New Testament: "Grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "Long for the spiritual milk which is without guile that ye may grow thereby unto salvation." "To walk worthily of the lord unte all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." and how many more passages: It is men and women who long and strive for the fulfilment of these possibilities in their own lives who are wanted in Christian service at home and abroad.

And "sanity" meaning "absence of tendency to extreme views." Certainly the opposite of these qualities is not desirable. How carefully in your books do you guard against certain extreme views regarding the millennial hope, regarding mysticism, regarding extreme intellectualism and extreme experimentalism, and many others! and how earnestly Paul counsels men: "Let your moderation, your forbearance, be known unto all men." "God gave us a spirit of power and love and of a sound mind." "Soberness" is one of his emphasized virtues and Peter's, toe. "He ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer." "Sherefore girding up the loins

of your mind, be sober and set your hope perfectly on the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." This is true sanity, the sanity desired in missionaries. (Cf. Gal. V. 25, fl Feter 1.6).

and note the place of these questions and their relationship to other questions in the blank. "Tolerance of the point of view of others" is part of the eighth general subject. "Teamwork Qualities." Four are mentioned, as follows: "a. Tact. b. Tolerance of the point of view of others. c. Solf-centrol. d. Flexibility. (Subordination when best of one's own ambitions and preferences.)" The tenth subject of inquiry is "Spiritual Qualities" and the subheads are: "a. Christian character. b. Vital religious experience. c. Spiritual influence on others." The eleventh subject is "Promise of Development in the Christian life" and the subheads are: "a. Desire to progress in spiritual truth. b. Engerness for Christian service. c. Sanity. (Absence of tendency to extreme views)." Then follow questions as to the experience of the candidate in various forms of practical work and Christian service.

To twist these simple and reasonable and wise questions and to freight them with suspicion is an untrue and unjust note in your paper.

5. You say that in the "Candidate Reference Blank" "there is not one word to determine the cardidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the Coapel." That is covered (1) by the constitutional requirements of the Church with regard to the examinations of ordained candidates by their Presbyteries which are reported to the Board. (Frequent actions of the General Assembly have dealt with this matter of the functions of Mission Boards and Presbyteries in this regard. The question as respects the Foreign Board was passed upon by the Board and by the General Assembly in 1902 and 1905 when Dr. W. M. Paxton and Dr. Hobert Sussell Booth and Dr. John Fox, who were them members of the Board, were particularly concorned in the decisions reached, and in 1893, 1910 and 1921. (2) By the three questions to which most space is given and which are doesed the most important questions on the "Candidate Reference Blank", musely, "Tould you recommend appointment?" "If not, what would agen to be the weak points or faults which in your judgment should disqualify the applicant from foreign mission work?" "Unhaspered by any questions, please state frankly your own opinion as to the general fitness of the candidate for the work of a foreign wiselonary?" (3) By the inclusion in the Personal Apelication Blank filled out by every layman and woman candidate of the four Constitutional questions propounded by Presbyteries to candidates for ordination. (4) By the following questions: "Shat is your habit in devotional Bible study and prayer?" "No you believe that in every form of mission work the parasount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord and Master?" "Is it your purpose to make this the chief alm of your missionary service, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?"

(6) By requiring from every condidate, ordained and unordained, a separate letter. The requirement is thus expressed on all application blanks:

"WRITE A EXPARATE LETTER giving in brief: (a) A sketch of your life; (b)
Tour Christian development and experience; (c) Your motives in scaling
missionary appointment; (d) The content of your Christian Mountage."

he explaining what is involved the following statement is sent to every candidate who is not under care and examination of a Presbytery:

## "The Content of your Caristian Message.

This question is vital. You propose to go to a foreign land in order to propagate the Christian religion, either by public address, or by personal contacts, or by both. It is of utmost importance that you should have a clear idea of what this religion is. Any positive statements upon Christian faith and practice which you wish to make should be set forth here, and will naturally include your idea of God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the redemptive work of Christianity, duties to your fellow men, the Bible, the Church, together with such other leading truths as you would expect to embody in your message. Such condensation is desired as may be consistent with a satisfactory setting forth of your views."

Possibly you may never have seen this last statement. It has been in use for the past six years.

In the light of these statements I think your criticism of the blanks is untrue and unjust.

6. You criticize also the question on the application blank with regard to the ability of the candidate to "Cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your (his) own opinions," and you are dissatisfied with Er. Hadley's explanation that this does not refer to theological convictions but to capacity to work with others happily in attending to our main common business and in pursuing our definite and united aim even though there may be differences of opinion over questions of method and policy and judgment, and other things too. Such ability to work with others is certainly important. In the Shantung Mission in China there were three strong personalities - Dr. Nevius, Dr. Nateer and Dr. Corbett. These men were wide apart in their opinions as to missionary policy and method, but they were able to adjust themselves and to establish and carry forward one of the best missions of our Church. Mr. Hadley was right in interpreting this question in this sense, as raising not the issue of evangelical theological views, which are the expected basis of missionary appointment, but "the question of temperament and ability to work in fullest harmony with people in the small group which is usually found in a mission station."

The question on the application blank is an old, old question. It has been used for many years; in its present form for the past seven years. It has never had any reference to theological views. They are covered, as I have pointed out, in other ways.

7. You criticize also the two questions which emphasize the "paramount duty" and "the chief aim" of each missionary "to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, hord and Master." Surely this is just what the Church wasts to be assured of in its foreign missionaries, that every one of them will set the spiritual, evangelistic purpose in the first place and, as the Board's Manual says, will make "all methods and forms of missionary service contribute to the realisation of this aim." I shall refer later to your rejection of this statement of the missionary aim but I would refer hore, though I shall refer again also to this, to your statement that the use in these questions of the terms "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" is "studiedly vague." That statement is both untrue and unjust. It is the kind of statement regarding your Christian brethren which both the Scriptures and the Standards of our Church forbid. I use the term "Saviour" and "Lord" and "Master", and my associates use them

and they are used by the Board in these questions in the same sense, in the full sense, in the sincere and explicit sense in which they are used in the Cospels, in the Boek of acts, in the Spistles and in the Revelation — in that sense and in no other. If you think that they are not adequate or that they are "studiedly vague" your controversy is with the New Yestament whose meaning and authority in this and in all things I unreservedly accept and with whose very words I am content.

8. You refer to the fact that on May 8, 1928, "no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the Mational Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the Foreign Board "were signers of the 'Amburn Affirmation'", and that four of the five in the case of the Foreign Board are utill members of the Board and that Mr. Hadley, the present Candidate Secretary of the Board, was also a signer, though at the time he signed he had not become a secretary of the Board. If I were a minister I would not have signed the "Amburn Affirmation." Her would I sign any other except the great affirmation of our Confession: "The Supreme Judge can be no other but the Moly Spirit speaking in the Scripture."

I have, however, just re-read the "Affirmation" and note the following positive declaration:

"We affirm and declare our acceptance of the Westminster Confession of Faith, as we did at our ordination, 'as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.' We sincerely hold and carnestly preach the doctrines of evangelical Christianity, in agreement with the historic testimony of the Preabyterian Church in the United States of America, of which we are loyal ministers."

"we all hold most earnestly to these great facts and doctrines (i.e., the inspiration of the Bibls, and the Incarnation, the Atomement, the Resurrection, and the Continuing Life and Supernatural Power of our Lord Jesus Christ); we all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God; that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, and through Him we have our redemption; that having died for our sins He rose from the dead and is our everlasting Saviour; that in His earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works, and by His vacarious death and unfailing presence He is able to wave to the uttermost."

In their positive affirmation surely these men are as much entitled to be trusted and believed as you and I think we are, and if I understand at all the positions and principles of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. Patton there is basis here for righteous Christian cooperation.

9. The second part of your paper is devoted to my "utterances" as a "cause of disquiet regarding the Fereign Board." And the terms of your letter and the expressed suspicions and implied charges of your statement are a services to self-defense. I have been associated with the foreign mission work of our Charch in our Board for thirty-eight years. I have tried to serve faithfully and efficiently and I do not think the service needs to be vindicated to men. There is a Master whom you and I are both trying to serve and His judgment is the only judgment which need such concern us, and you and I are both clearly known to Him. But one is glad of the opportunity to bear his Christian witness to our glorious Lord and His Gospel and to seek to relieve the foreign mission cause, to which long ago I gave my whole life from the suspicions and distruct which you think my utterances have orought upon it.

The chief ground of complaint and criticism in your statement with regard to me relates to the little book "Are Foreign Missions Done For?" and its statement of the sime of foreign missions. Inasmuch as this statement of aim is quoted in the book from the Board's Manual, where it has stood in its present form for many years, I am glad to retire for a time, with the little book, into the background and shall take up your attack on the statement of the missionary aim, to which also reference was earlier made. The statement which you criticize is as follows:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

You object to this as "evasive and vague" and because it does not explicitly "declare the absolute necessity for every missionary of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God."

In reply I would say: (1) This statement of the supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions was prepared in its present form by a committee of the Post War Conference of the Board with representatives of the Eiszions held at Princeton in June 1920. The Chairman of this committee was the Hev. J. Talter Lowrie, h.D., of China, later secretary of the Bible Union of China. It was he who helped to form this statement, which the Conference unanimously adopted for just what it was intended to be, no more and no less. It was not a statement of the doctrinal content of the Cospel message. It was the briefest possible declaration of the central purpose of missions with due subordination of its various elements. That central purpose most assuredly is to make known our Lord Jesus Christ the Eavieur of the World. (2) The statement is absolutely and faithfully Scriptural. It gathers together the words and thoughts of the Great Commission in its various forms: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, "And Me taid unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Cospel to every "And We taid unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Cospel to every creature." "And ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Sameria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

All your criticisms of the aim as stated are equally applicable, some of them more so, to the last commands of our Lord. These commands do not mention the things you require to have mentioned. They do not contain certain ideas which you disapprove. Your views explain away and even attack the clear meaning and the very words of the Great Commission as Matthew records it.

(3) You susmarise your criticism of the statement of aim by saying "In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the

precious blood of Christ." I think that any fair and candid Christian mind will find not only a hint of these things but far more than a hint in the plain, honest words of the aim if hencrably and fair mindedly construed. These and other elements of the Gospel would be included in a statement of the content of the message which the missionary is to make known, but they do not naturally or essentially fall in a sentence-statement of the central and controlling aim. That aim is to make our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, known to the world. Paul writes to the Ephesians, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints was this grace given to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Some of those riches he proceeds to unfold but by no means all, and he makes no mention of some of the particulars in which, of course, he believed but all of which he never attempted to summarize in any statement of his central, single missionary purpose.

I think you make three great mistakes here (1) You confuse the statement of the aim of missions to proclaim the Gospel of Christ with the statement of the content of the message of the Gospel. (2) You allow your suspicion and distrust of others, your judging as you would not be judged, to deflect and poison your view. When you call Jesus Christ "Lord and Master" you say the words are used honestly, but when I call Him so, the words are used dishonestly. This is untrue and unjust." It is more than that. Paul says explicitly, "No man can say Jesus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit." You appear flatly to dispute Paul and to believe that men can call Jesus Lord by the evil spirit. Our Lord spoke some stern words about this kind of judgment. (3) You unmistakably imply that the failure specifically to mention certain great doctrines is evidence that those doctrines are not believed.

10. I will go on to deal specifically with this point. You say that "the vagueness which characterizes this utterance (i.e., the statement of aim) also characterizes the whole booklet (i.e., "Are Foreign Missions Done For?") There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scropture (indeed no mention of Scripture as such at all) no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ."

Before examining this statement and the implications which you put into it and the inferences which you draw out of it, I wish to make my position unmistakably olear. I am an evangelical Christian believer. I accept all the facts, all the doctrines, all the truths of the New Testament. I stated my convictions summarily in an article in the International Review of Missions, October 1923, on "Missionary Cooperation in Face of Doctrinal Difference", as follows:

"Before attempting to answer these questions, the writer of this paper ought perhaps, in order to avoid all misunderstanding, to state his own point of view. He accepts the whole of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament. He believes unqualifiedly every article of the Apostles' Creed. No language is adequate to state his conception of Christ. He believes that He is more and greater than any words can ever express, 'the Word made flesh,' God incarnate, reconciling the world to Himself, the only Saviour, our Lord and our God. He believes in the truthfulness of the record of Christ's life, including His miracles, and rejoices with great joy in the miracle of the Virgin Birth and of the real Resurrection of Christ and of His future personal advent. He believes

that it is ded alone who through Christ saves men, not by their characters, nor by any work of righteousness which they can do, but by his own grace through the death and life of His dear son. As to the Bible, he accepts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession and regards its authority as supreme, not in faith only but also in the practice, conduct and relations of men. I am afraid this may seem to many very antiquated and unmodern, and the writer must be prepared to accept shatever limitations of value in the modern mind such views set upon his judgment as to the doctrinal limits of tolerance and the doctrinal basis of cooperation."

as to our Lord, I spoke fully and definitely in the Moderator's sermon at the General Assembly in 1928. I am no theologian and I did not and cannot speak in terms of systematized theology (which I respect and believe to be necessary) but I believe in the baviour and His glory and His redeeming work as deeply and truly and lovingly as you can believe in Him. I tried to say this at the Assembly in Tulsa. These were some of the words I used:

"There is nothing good or great that we will not say about Jesus. There is no claim that we will not make for Mim. There is naught that we can say about God that we will not say also about Jesus, 'the Sen of Mis love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sine: who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation; for in Him wore all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is above all things, and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body the Church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the presminence. For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and through Nim to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens. '

said and then we will say that He is more than this. All that men have said or even can say about His glory, His beauty, His power, His delty we will say. He is all this and He transcends all this. Here let us stand each for himself and all of us as Christ's Church and henceforth let no man trouble us for we bear in our mind and in our heart, in our spirit and in our body the marks of the Lord Jesus."....

"But all words fall short of the reality with regard to Christ. If He were nothing but a good dead man who spoke and wrought as wisely as He knew long ago in Palestine, who died bravely on a Gross with no hate of those who did such hateful wrong, and over whose undisturbed grave the Syrian stars look down, then we should have much scruple lest we should wrong His memory with excess speech. Indeed long ago

we should have found the adequate words to describe His humanity. But to us Jesus Christ is not a good dead man but God, the living Cod, our Hisen and Living Savieur, and we will use all the language we have and deem it simple and poor to utter the wonder that is beyond all utterance.

"Mevertheless we can make our confession. We confess Him in the august symbols of our historic creeks and confessions."

You may not call these "vague and evasive" words. You may not call them, as you do call the sincere and earnest utterances of our missionaries and of the secretaries of our Board, "perfunctory lip service." If you do, you will have to answer before our lord and Judge; may you will receive even now in your mind and character God's inevitable penalty upon such un-Christian and un-Christlike judgment of a man on his fellow Christians. Let us both be mindful of our Master's words. (Natt. VII. I-4).

Now let us examine this present criticism. (1) You say that my little book does not mention the Virgin Birth and its place in Christian faith. That is true. Neither is it mentioned in your book on "The Origin of Paul's Beligion." You there set forth the details of Jesus' life which were known to Paul but you make no mention among them of the Virgin The single mention of it in your book "What is Maith?" is in the question which is asked in a purely incidental and secondary way. "what has it (i.e., simple trust like that of the Centurion) to do with a question of fact like the question of the virgin birth?" (p. 91). You go on on this same page to state what we need to know about Jesus. You do not mention the Virgin Birth. Those two books are serious and competent theological studies. One might expect to find clear mention in them, especially in a discussion of "That is Faith?" of all that the writer deemed essential. You sait the Virgin Birth in these studies of the content of Paul's Cospel and of the Christian faith and then condemn my soor little booklet on our foreign mission duty because I do not mention a truth which I had no occasion to mention here but which I joyfully believe and have set forth elsewhere at greater length and particularity than I have seen or heard of in any writings of yours.

And are you prepared to condemn every book that does not set forth the Virgin Birth of our hord and of absolute necessity of belief in it for all Christian preachers and teachers? Br. Patton has written a neble book on "Fundamental Christianity." Surely he will deal with the Virgin Birth here as you require. Boes he? Not once does he mention it, save incidentally in the mention of the Virgin Mary and the Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. In Br. A. A. Redge's "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes" there is, if I am not mistaken, a single reference to the Virgin Mary and not a word about the theological significance of the Virgin Birth. Even in the three great volumes of Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology" the index does not mention "Virgin Birth". It refers only to Homan ideas of the Virgin Mary. And in the text the fact and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth receive

almost no attention. Under "Particular Passages which teach the Divinity of Christ" me reference is made to the Virgin Birth. Under the Person of Christ there are a few references to it, chiefly relating to the human nature in Jesus and the substance of His body. There is no reference whatever to the place of the Virgin Birth in the Christian message nor any such treatment of its theological significance as one finds, for example, in Bu Bose's "Soteriology of the New Testament."

Do not misunderstand me. I believe in the Virgin Birth and I regard it, in Dr. George Alexander's words, as "a peculiarly precious truth." And I know that of course Dr. Patton believes it. But the idea that failure to mention it implies disbelief and that every book which chits it is unevangelical is untrue and irrational. Consider the result of the application of your requirements here to the volume entitled "Biblioal and Theological Studies by the Faculty of Princeton It is a great volume of the Founding of the Seminary" (1912). Here, surely, one would feel that he had a right to of 634 pages. Here, surely, one would feel that he had a right to expect a full statement of the Cospel which the Seminary was established to teach, a presentation of the essential and fundamental teaching of Christianity, setting forth with special clearness the Christian message Dr. Patton in his opening paper says, "My theme for our time. embraces the entire circle of theological learning." Your criticism of our statement of aim is that it is not enough to speak of the circle; all the contents of the circle must be explicitly spoken of also, and you name certain contents whose verbal omission is proof of unevangelicalism and Well, let us see. This hage of a vague and evasive insincerity. and sincere theological volume contains not a single reference to the Virgin Birth. The one reference to the Second Coming of Christ is in a peper by Dr. Erdman. That is the only one. There is & paper on "Sin and Grace in the Koran" but none on "Sin and Grace in the Cospel." There is a "Study of Jonathan Edwards" and another of "The Aranaic of Baniel" and another of "The Shepherd of Hermas" but none of "the truthfulness of the Scriptures", of "the new birth of believers" of "justification by faith", of "the atoning death of Christ." What if one should use your own words: "That sort of a Cospel is it from which all that makes a Cospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offence of the Cross is done away but so is the glory and the power." These words might far more justly be used here than with regard to my little missionary book. This is a great theological presentation of the Gospel offered in commemoration of a century's life of a great school whose business it is to set forth the content of the Gospel. But I will not use your words. I think the volume is a worthy Christian production and one of the best things in it is the passage in your paper, where, more adequately than any where else, you recognize (p. 575) the Pauline doctrine and I think its omissions are justified on the of the Resurrection. ground on which you justify emissions in Paul's Epistles, namely, "It is omitted not because it is unimportant but on the contrary because it is fundamental" (p. 862). I think that is a valid justification of these "Biblical and Theological Studies" with their vast omissions. I think it is valid in the case of many omissions in your books. Will you not be equally fair-minded toward others?

(2) You say there is "no mention of the bodily resurrection" in my little book. The Presurrection is mentioned more than once and by that I

mean the bodily Resurrection of our Lord, but I did not use the phrase. Meither have you used it in a single one of your three books which I have read. And it is not used in the New Testament? The New Testament is content to speak of the Resurrection, meaning the real and actual Resurrection of our Lord and I am content with the language of the New Testament. And as to the reality of the bodily Resurrection of our Lord I hold with Paul that it is the supreme fact and truth in Christianity.

- (3) You say there is "no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all)." Again you are mistaken. The Bible, the New Testament, the Word of God are all mentioned repeatedly. The full truthfulness of Scripture is everywhere assumed. I accept joyfully, and we expect each missionary to accept, the doctrine of our Standards with regard to the Scriptures. But I must honestly say that there is something which appears to be not altogether candid, I will not say "evasive", in your own references to the inspiration of the Scriptures. One notes the care with which you refrain from facing certain issues and from using the language of some of those whom you allow to think that you agree with them. And do you or do you not agree with Dr. Patton's position in "Fundamental Christianity."?
- Two of your three books make no mention of the supernatural return of Christ". Two of your three books make no mention of it. I find no mention of it in \$.4. Rodge's "Popular Lectures." As for me I have cherished this faith and hope for forty-two years. By boyhood ministers, one a graduate of Princeton Reminary and all the orthodox of the orthodox, spiritualized this truth completely out of the Bible but I learned it at the Northfield Conference when I was a Sophomore in college and I have lived with it and in it ever since and have gladly borns some reproach because of it. I wrote a little book on it and have again and again preached it. I think I have borne ten times the witness to it which you have borne. But it did not soem to me to be necessary to introduce it into this little defence of missions. I was writing to defend foreign missions against their enemies. I did not realize that they would need to be defended from their friends.
- (a) You say there is "no mention of the new birth of believers, and no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ." You qualify this by recognizing "one bare mention of the Crucified and ever-biving bord." But would you think of the spirit of the statement that there was "one bare mention of the Virgin Birth" and "one bare mention of the revelation in "That is Faith?" But again you are mistaken. Those truths are either stated or implied or assumed in my booklet. More than this was not called for in the nature and purpose of the little book. It was not an attempt to set forth the content of the Christian message. It was simply a short and earnest presentation of the claim that Christ is the only and the sufficient Saviour.
- ll. The claims of Christ are not kept in the background. The little book is full of their assertion. It maintains, throughout, the sole sufficiency and universality of the Gospel: "Christ needs nothing from any one. He other religious teacher has any contribution to make to Him. In Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead. He is the final and sufficient revelation of God and the only Saviour and Redeemer of man. This is the New Testament representation. It is the solid and unalterable foundation of foreign missions. Foreign Missions are not a search for a new and better religion. They are not an attempt to find something that is not already in Christ. They are the effort of those who have heard of Christ to take what they have heard to the world in order

that all men together may learn more of Him." (p. 36) It conceives Christ, as the Scriptures do, as "the unconscious Besire of the Mations, the one answer to all the problems of the soul of man, his one Saviour and his only hope. A fundamental conviction for our Church in the work at home and abroad is this conviction that it has in Christ the sufficient Cospel. The Church is not looking for a new and different Gospel. It has found the one and only Saviour." "The Christian faith is a truth and a treasure greater than any other that we possess. It is our duty to mhere it and to appeal to allmen everywhere to take it as their own. It is theirs by the same title that makes it ours and there are depths in it which will only be found as we explore them tegether apprehending with all saints, as alone as can, the full dimensions of the love of Cod, and all attaining. as the only way in which any of us can attain, the unity of the faith and the stature, of the fulness of Christ. The truth that we need to keep in view and that it easy to forget is that Christ is greater than all our thoughts about Him and that as the whole world comes to know Him and to accept His Lordship new glories hitherto not seen in Rim will appear. But these glories are in Christ. They are not in the religious or racini cultures of Asia. And the revelation of them will not come from those religious or cultures. It will come from Christ as the result of a larger belief by mankied in Him and a larger application of His grace and power to human life throughout the world. This is the lesson we need to remember. Our ideas about Christ may be true as far as they go, but they do not go far enough. We may not hold that they are complete. But Christ is complete. In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." (p. 42). "Christ is absolute and final and He and His roligion are to prevail absolutely and finally." "It is Christ that we Christians are to all men here and throughout the world. position be regarded as assrow and families, then we sent accept such condemnation. Only we are sure that the same judgment must apply to the whole doctrine of the New Testament. The foreign missions enterprise recorded there rested upon precioaly this view of the uniqueness and sufficiency of Christ. The early Church believed that there was none other have given among men whereby they suct be saved. All men overywhere noeded Unriet and Christ was enough. Neither Greek, mar Bowns, nor Semitic religion had any correction to make or any supplement to add to Him. And the modern foreign missions enterprise stands on the same ground. It is the endeavor to make Christ known to all mankind, that all mankind together may live in Him and find in His more and greater treasures then any one race or any one soul can find alone. Nach race and each woul for itself can find in Him all that it knows that it needs. but only mankind altogether will discorn the full depths of human want and the infinite fulness of Christ's supply. He is adequate indeed to the full needs of each soul only because he is the whole world's sufficient taylour:

> 'in Nim is life provided For all mankind and me.'"

"I would rejoice to see the missionary enterprise brought in our day more clearly and loyally and uncomplainingly than ever to those fundamental ideas with which it began, and to see it disentangled, as far as we can disentangle it, from a great many of the compromising fellowships in which it finds itself, and released to do its pure, elementary, rational work down at the foundations of human life in relating men one by one to Jesus Christ as ford and Saviour." (p.102) "I grant that a man's judgment here will depend altegether on what his estimate is of Jesus Christ means nothing to him, shy, he will not see any necessity on the part of other men for knowing about him. But if Jesus Christ is all there is for us, if we know that He is all there is, then we cannot but recognize the inherent obligation in wealth like that to be shared with all who have not yet

come into its possession." (p.108). "The missionary enterprise is the proclamation of the Cne Hame given under Heaven among men whereby we must be saved, and there is nothing in any non-Christian religion to be added to the glory of Christ or to the fulness of the revelation of Christ, howbeit we so imperfectly apprehend it still. Inside the Christian spirit burns the old resolution that glowed in St. Paul's heart to whom it would have been 'woe', if he had not shared the Christ he knew. Would that we might get back again to the foreign missionary enterprise in the pure, naked spiritual reality of it, as Christ called that little group of men and women around Him at the first, who had no nations back of them, who were not going to speak for any race. They were just a little group of individuals whom Christ had redeemed and she knew their Redeemer, and He told them to go out and share what they had in Him with all the world. That is what the missionary enterprise has always been. That is what it is today - Christianity stripped of all accessories and secondary accoutrement, just Christ, Himself, to be offered to the whole world for which He died." (p.141).

These are only a few expressions from this little book. It is a poor little thing but it is not the vague and evasive and unevangelical thing you allege. And of the hundreds of evangelical men and women who have written or spoken about the book you are the only one of whom I have heard who condemns it. One of the warmest and most grateful of the letters of commendation is from an old friend, Dr. Albertus Pieters, of Holland, Michigan, as conservative in his theology as you or I can ever hope to be. There is enough evidence in sheaves of letters at hand that the little book has fortified evangelical conviction and confirmed true missionary devotion. I will not quote them — yet I will quote from several that you may know the feeling of some not one whit less realous than you:

"I have just finished the reading of your book, so kindly sent to me, entitled 'Are Foreign Bissions Bone For?' It is now after twelve o'clock, P.B. I cannot express to you the joy I received in reading it. After having much of my former seal for missions dampened by recent post graduate studies in the University of - and the coldness of the churches that I have tried to interest in a feeble way, I now rededicate myself answ to the task of missions and recoive to do my best to give and stimulate giving in the little church I am called to serve.

"I can fully appreciate the difference between 'The religion of the good dead man' and the 'Religion of a good living God."

. . . . . . . . . .

"On the day that your little book 'Are Foreign Missions Bone For?' came to us, I read it and decided to write you at once in regard to a further distribution of it. I probably felt that you know your own business, but in the light of some college periodicals recently received I know my first impulse was right.

"I would like to have the whole thing, or perhaps only the chapter 'Christ is Emough' printed for large distribution among our college organizations."

. . . . . . . . . .

"The more I read this volume the more I am impressed with its value and importance, coming especially at this time. It is the ablest defense or justification of Foreign Missions that has yet been sent forth. It will be sure to strengthen those who are faltering and win over those who are hostile or who are lukewarm and indifferent. The great Head of the Church must have put it into your heart to write it and I am sure will use it in stirring the whole Church up to a renewed sense of its great responsibility in regard to the whole matter."

. . . . . . . .

"For quite a long time I have wanted to write to you. After reading your recent booklet, 'Are Foreign Missions Bone For?' I cause t refrain from writing. I want to thank you with all my heart for the stand and the messages in that booklet. Fundamentally, while defending the foreign mission movement from modern criticisms, it is a call back to the original motive of foreign missions. I found myself in complete agreement with every page of the book."

. . . . . . . .

"I have just read 'Are Foreign Missions Done For?' at one sitting and I can't resist saying how wonderful it is. To my mind it is the most unanswerable argument I have ever seen. I do hope somebody is giving it wide circulation. There is too much loose talk going about, even among people who know better, about one religion completing or complementing another. You are right, Christianity needs no completion — it is complete — it needs discovery."

. . . . . . . .

"Reading this wonderful little book of yours I feel convinced that you still stand firm on the old reliable Faith once delivered unto the Saints."

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

This last is from the "Church or the Lutheran Brethren." I am achamed to have quoted these. I dare to use Paul's words: "I am become foolish; ye have compelled me."

I have written quite enough and more than ought to have been required. I could answer some of your criticisms by quoting from your own books the statement of the very traths for which you condemn me. There are two things more of which I shall speak. (1) The first is this: I find myself in deep and thankful accord with almost all of your great convictions. I am full of admiration and gratitude for "The Origin of Paul's Religion" and agree with you in your emphasis on the historicity and supernaturalness of the facts of Christianity's beginning and the necessity of the great Christian doctrines undetachable from these facts, on the need of reasoned doctrinal statement and defense, on the great doctrines of ain and faith, on the Person of Christ, on miracles, on Christianity as a message as well as an experience and a life, and I might go on with the long list of all the evangelical convictions. There I differ from you is at the

points where, as it seems to me, you differ from the Scriptures. Some great Scripture truths you ignore or qualify. You twist or interpret some passages out of their plain and obvious statement. You use non-Scriptural, even anti-Scriptural forms of thought and expression. When apparently contradictory ideas or statements are found in the New Testament you modify one or the other or both to fit your scheme of thought instead of accepting them both just as they are without qualification as parts of larger truth or life which comprehends both without any minimization. You do no justice to Paul's moral and social applications of the Gospel and you even indulge in a fling at some ministers who read the sixth chapter of Ephesians to their people. There are illustrations in your paper which we are considering. There you use some words in your statement of essential doctrine which are not found in the Scriptures at all. I can state my convictions wholly in the very words of the Scriptures. You use repeatedly the phrase "the gospel of the Gross". This phrase is not in the Scriptures. The New Testament knows "the Gospel", "the Gospel of Christ", "the Gospel of the Kingdom", "the Gospel of peace." "the Cospel of Cod", "the everlasting Cospel", but it nowhere uses the phrase "the Cospel of the Cross" and the use which you make of that phrase implies interpretations both of the idea of the "Gospel" and of the idea of the Crose which do not do justice to the full New Testament teaching. The Gospel is not the Cospel of the Cross only, not even of the Cross of Christ only. The Cospel is the Cospel of Christ which includes the Cross and what preceded the Cross and what followed the Cross. The same defect marks your use of the idea of "salayation only by the Cross," and your criticism of my reference to the "redeeming life" of Christ. Your view certainly does not do full justice to the Scriptures nor does it represent the true Scriptural proportion of truth. You say in "What is Faith?" "Christ touches our lives, according to the New Testament through the Gross." (p. 143 but compare Heb. II.18; IV., 15, 16.) "The Cross of Christ is the special basis of Christian faith". (p.144-But compare I. Cor. XV. 17). "The Cross by which salvation was wrought." (your statement: But compare Rom. I.16. V. 10). You do not and cannot too much exalt the Cross of Christ, but you can and you do fail to set it in its Scriptural place and relationship and you neglect to relate it adequately to the full truth of the New Testament. You do not give their full Scriptural place to the Incarnation prior to the Cross or to the Resurrection and many other aspects of the full truth of the Gospel. You justly emphasize the fact of the Resurrection and its evidential significance but you do not adequately set forth its relation to the redeeming work of Christ, its place in our salvation. or its practical and dynamic significance in the life of the believer as the New Testament sets forth all these aspects. You do indeed in brief references couple the Cross and the Resurrection in their relation to salvation. In "That is Paith?" you speak of "the Gospel of redemption through the Cross and resurrection of Christ" (p.p. 184,181). Also "The Origin of Paul's Religion," p. 167. In view of your criticism of my use once of the word "Spirit" with a small "s", one notes that you habitually write "Cross" and sometimes of late, though not earlier, Virgin Birth with a capital and the "resurrection" without it.) But you criticise my truly coriptural reference to the "redeeming life" of Christ (Rom. VI., 1-11; VII, 4: VIII, 1-14).

The New Testament teaching is far richer and freer than your view appears to be. It teaches not that the Cross caves us or that we are saved by the Cross. It teaches that Christ saves us, and that He saves us by Himself, by His death and by His life. How rich is Paul's orientation and proportion of these truths! "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from weath through Him. For if, when we were ensence, we were reconciled to God by the Beath of his Son, much more, being

reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." (Rom. V. . 3-11). Let any one take his New Testament and read it through, marking every reference to the Cross and the death of Christ and every reference to the Resurrection and the life of Christ and compare the result with the proportions of these glorious facts and doctrines in your emphasis. "Christ died for our sins" you duste often and you cannot quote too often. But only occasionally do you add "according to the Scriptures" and still less frequently do you complete the quotation and add "And He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." Of course you believe this and rejoice in it, but you do not relate these truths as Paul does and you substitute the Cross which might have been without the Resurrection for the place of the Resurrection which included the Cross. The Cross without the Resurroction would not have saved us. Paul proceeds in this very chapter to declare in language which takes our breath away: "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins" [I.Cor.IV.17]. And one might go on to speak of Peter's teaching of the relation of the Resurrection to regeneration and salvation. This full Gospel of the New Testament is the glorious Gospel. I do not share your view that it can only be preached offensively. The Cross is indeed to many a stumbling block. Paul and Peter both realized and declared this. Paul also said: "Give none offesce, neither to the Jews, nor to the Centiles, nor to the church of God. Even as I please all men in all thinge, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye imitators of me, even as I am of Christ." "Giving no offence in anything, that the ministry be not blased. But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, nor walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully: but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." There is clearly in Paul's view a vast difference between the preaching of the offence of the Cross and the offensive preaching of the Cross. The word for "offence" which Paul uses in Gal. V.11 and I. Cor. 11., 25 and which Peter uses in 1. Peter 11.,8 is the very same which Paul uses in Rom. XIV.,13 and XVI.,17, and which the Saviour uses in his dreadful warning in Luke XVII.1, 2, and which in the American Standard Revised is translated in all these passages not "offence" or "offend", but "stumbling block" or "cause to stumble." It were well if we remembered these words in our Christian fellowship within and in our proclamation of Christ and His Gospel to those she are without; "Then said he unto the disciples. It is impossible but that offences will come: but we unto him, through whom they come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck. and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones." "Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way." I know that in the parallel passage in Matthew the words "little ones" are followed by the words "that believe in Me," but surely the Spirit of Christ would not have us think that the Tender Shepherd of His little ones, who left the minety and nine safe sheep in the fold to hunt the one that was lost, would be pleased with the thought that His disciples should measure their fidelity by their success in "offending", in "causing to stumble" the feet that out of the way.

and a great deal more might be said of the failure of your book to set forth "the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God," to use your own phrase. But I do not suspect or reproach you as heretical or unevangelical. I believe that God and the Gospel and its grace are supernatural and infinite and if they are, while we may know them surely and truly, we may know, as Paul

. himself says, only in part. But we are Christ's true disciples none the less, and we ought to love one another and walk together "comforted each of us by the other's faith", and making up each of us what is lacking in the other.

Perhaps you will be tempted to dismiss what I have just been saying as the simple, unsophisticated talk of one who is unschooled in theological systematisation and no scholar in the field of theological controversy. It is even so. I do not pretend to be saything but a simple, Bible—Christian who holds that under the grand liberty of our Confession he is free to believe all that he finds in the Scriptures as he finds it there and to reject whatever he sees which contradicts or deflects or malforms the rich and varied truth of the Scriptures. If anything that I say here or elsewhere is at variance with the Scriptures, if it declares what the Scriptures do not truly declare, or fails to declare what the Scriptures do truly declare, I shall be glad to have it shown and shall rejoicingly leave any error for the truth. Is this not evangelical?

(2) And now lastly, you say "What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified - not in some pale modern sense but as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board?" I do not like the slurring reference to the light which the sacrifice of life by men may help us to see in the divine fulness of the meaning of the death of Christ. But your question can be answered with an answer absolutely flat and clear. I ask you to read Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Conference of the Board and the Missions in 1910 on "The Gospel of Paul." There the Gospel is described which the Ecord exists to spread abroad. The Foreign Board exists and its missionaries are appointed and maintained for one supreme purpose, namely, to proclaim to the world the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Incurnate, Crucified, Risen, Alive for Evermore, the Sinless One, the only Saviour, "who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom/man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power eternal. Amen."

I said at the outset that I would speak finally of your paper as a whole. Perhaps, however, it is hardly necessary to do this except to may that the particular items of evidence which you have presented as justifying your negative answer to the query "Can Evangelical Christians support our Foreign Baard?" appear to me to be inadequate and, as I have sought to show, so unfounded, that one wonders how a just and brothe ly Christian view could have rested upon them so grave an inquiry and so grave a proposal as the establishment of a rival foreign missionary agency in our Church, independent of the General Assembly and supported by members of our Church who proclaim their feilow members to be unevangelical. And you rest this inquiry and this proposal on unwarranted impressions regarding a few questions on the "Reference Blank", a few thoroughly sensible and right letters from Mr. Hadley in explanation, a criticism of a Scriptural statement of our missionary aim. a few random and detached quotations from things that I have written, a mass of your own suspicions, and arguments from silences which your own books would not bear. My utterances which you have quoted here, I believe, both

true and Scriptural but you might have quoted, if you had willed or known, a great mass of statements in addresses and books which you could not misuse as you have misused those in your paper. A man like you, devoted to scholarship, could not give his time to reading such simple books as mine, but they are loyal books, and their teaching has sought to be faithful to our Divine lord and his Nord.

The paper, as a whole, is as "untrue and unjust" as it is in detail. It is not worthy or you or of the Gospel or of the fellowship of the Gospel. And I do carnestly trust that what I have said in this letter will lead you to lay it aside, to dismiss your distrust and to join generously and faithfully in our great task of carrying to the son-Christian people the Gospel of Christ, "the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God." And look at the real work before us here at home - in ignorance and unbelief, in slackness of moral and social standards, in sin and infidelity, in imperfection and unworthiness of faith and life in the Church, in the need of men everywhere for Christ. Contend for the faith within the Church but with equal seal proclaim it to those who are without.

and now one more quotation from what you have written, not in this present statement of yours with its proposal of division and schism in our Church and its work, but in the closing paragraph of your book "Christianity and Liberaliem."

"Is there no refuge from strife? Is there no place of refreshing where a man can prepare for the battle of life? Is there no place where two or three can gather in Jesus' name, to forget for the moment all those things that divide mation from nation and race from race, to forget human pride, to forget the passion of war, to forget the pursling problems of industrial strife, and to unite in overflowing gratitude at the foot of the Cross? If there be such a place, then that is the house of God and that the gate of heaven, and from under the threshold of that house will go forth a river that will revive the wear; world."

Beyond that there was an empty tomb and a Risen and Living Lord. "United with Ris in the likeness of Ris Beath", shall we not also be united with Rim and therefore with one crether "in the likeness of His Besurrection." Can we not, my friend, put away all this bitterness and railing and suspicion and be kind and tender-hearted and trustful? And can we not be spared the shame and waste of such a baseless controversy as a controversy like this between you and me would be and give surselves and all our strength to better and trust things? Is not saul's counsel, "walk in sisder toward them that are without, redeeming the time," doubly applicable to our relationship and our work within the company of us who truly love and wish truly to serve our Common hord?

If what I have written does not avail to persuade you and if you still think that it is your duty to publish your paper, surely it is only fair and right that my answer should be published with it. In that case I am propared to meet my proportionate share of the expense. But, my dear friend, there is a more excellent way.

Very faithfully yours,

April 30, 1929

Professor J. Gresham Machen, D.D. Box A., Princeton New Jersey.

My dear Dr. Machen:

I have already acknowledged the receipt of your letter of April 12th, 1929, with your accompanying paper entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" which you asked me to examine and criticize in order that if it contained anything "untrue or unjust" you might correct it. You courte-ously added that you would be grateful for any assistance that I might render to this end. I am very glad to respond and to try to help you to an affirmative answer to the question in your paper. I believe that my own Christian convictions are not less evangelical than yours, and I believe that our foreign missionary work and workers are also truly evangelical. If I were not convinced of both of these things I should not be associated with our Foreign Board or with the Preabyterian Church. And I use the word evangelical, as will appear, in its plain and honest sense of fidelity to the full Scriptural warrant and content of the ospel.

I will try first to indicate particular points in your paper which appear to me to be "untrue or unjust" and then I shall speak of the paper as a whole.

1. Your contrast and implied antagonism between the "humanitarian service" of the B ard and "propa ating the Cospel of Jesus C rist as it is contained in the whole ..ord of God" appears to me to be unjust and untrue and uncriptural. It is of course possible to divide the first from the second but not the second from the first. The Gos el incluses human service. rie ... lesta nt as full or that princile. It insists on such service as on f t' evidences and fruits or fidelity to the Gospel. Furt rmore, it is by the expression of the Gospel in deeds as well as in wor's that the Cosp 1 was or ac ed and is ever to be preached. Indeed, in many 1 man es there or no words w.ic had the significance of the English or Creek ords emodying the truth of the Gospel and in these languages old words had to be taken and iven a new content by life, as the Incarnation and its intrpoet tion did at the reginnin . It is true that our Bo rd is carrying on a great body or human service and any one w.o is desirous of doin, such work can not find any better op ortunity for it t an here, but our "ourd has al a stade it pe feetly clear that in our policy all philanthropic work is tributary to and associated ith the primary aim of evan elization. I have expressed my own convictions on this point again and again. One quotation from "ission ry Principl's and Practice' (1902) ill sufice: "In all use of philanthropic effort, such as regical missions, relief ork, etc., as a met od of mi. sion work, the dominant at etermining air must

be evangelistic. Such work is useful as securin, fri ndship, removing poundice. representing the helpful, unselfish spirit of Christianity, contributin to the preaching of Christ, and the revolation of Him as Saviour and Lord, the source of all life and hope, and as relieving suffering; but it is not the rese asibility of the foreign missionary enterprise to care for the sickness and suffering of the world. Times of critical need may occur, as in great famine and postilence. when a broad liberty of action must be recognized; but in general, the air of our philanthropic work should be to contribute directly to the preaching of the Gospel. the establishment of the Christian Church, and to the fosteria, of that Christian spirit which will provide, through the native Church which is growing up and through the people themselves, the salutary fruits of Christianity in philanthropic and humanitarian effort. As a missionary method, pullanthropic work should ordinarily be limited, therefore, by the possibility of its evan elistic utilization and influence. A small development of such work contributin, powerfully in the direction indicated is better than a large developm at of but feeble or indirect evangelistic influence." I think it is an error in your paper and in all your books that you do not adequately recognize and set forth the full doctrine of the Scriptures, namely, that the Cospel is to be preached not by word only but also and not less, or less fundamentally, by deeds of love and morey. And thus pr ached by word and deed by our Presbyterian Church's Missions true fruitage has followed. Converts have been won and churches have been established as numerous and of as true New Testament character as have resulted from the work of any other missions. You are invited to make any comparison you please, including the undenominational Missions which you have sometimes praised for what you regarded as their superior dootrinal fidelity.

2. It is not for me to presume to defend the General Assembly and the Church at large against your expressions of distrust or your intimations that the Church and the Assembly are not really evan elical. I believe that our Church is evangelical. I wish with you that it were better instructed in the doctrine and more animated by the spirit of the Cospel, but I believe, too, that it is officially and really a truly evangelical Church and I believe, too, that the Foreira Board has not lost its confidence. There are, of course, individuals, like yourself, who feel and express distrust, but I believe you and they are mistaken in this and that the Church is warmly and evang lically loyal both to the ospel and to the Board and the cause which it represents.

Perhaps I should say a word re arding the footnote referring to the General assembly in 1927 when, against my reluctance and protest, I was made Moderator. As to my action in connection with Judicial Case No. 1, I erred in unwittingly failin, to note and to prevent the voting of members of refork Synod on either side of the question, to the ext not to which any of them did vot. These were not, however, the only votes illusally cast. And there were other and graver errors antecedent to these for suich I was not responsible and which I could not prevent. For the good and honor of the Church it is better to pass them over, but if this matter is to be brought forward to whole story should be unflinchingly told. I candidly summarized the situation at the meeting of the Assembly the following mornin, and the Assembly unanimously sustained my position.

I note your depreciation of the worth of an endorsement of the Forein Bourd by the General Assembly out perhaps you would think more kindly of the resolutions of the Assembly at Grand Rapids in 1924 adopt don recommendation of the Standing Committee on Foreign Missions, of which Dr. MacLennan was

Chairman and Dr. Robert Dick Milson was a member, with regard to union and cooperative enterprises, the selection of missionary candidates, the use of schools and hospitals, and the proclamation of the Gospel which, however, the Committee did not feel bound to describe and define. These were four of the resolutions:

"That while maintaining loyally the policy established by past General Assemblies in repeated enactments with regard to cooperation with other Evangelical bodies in our Forei m Missionary Work the Board be directed to exercise due care with regard to the Evangelical character of all such union and cooperative enterprise, and if there should arise in the work of these enterprises a situation in which teachings unsound or injurious to the Evangelical Faith are given, the Board, as it has declared to be its policy, should either secure the correction of such a situation or failing such withdraw from further participation.

"That the Board be commended for its care in the selection and appointment of candidates for the Foreign Field, and that they be requested to continue to exercise the most scrupulous care in this regard,

"That we rejoice in all the courage in which in home and Church. in hospital and school, by word and by the printed page, Christ has been preached to men, and we assure the Missionaries and native churches of our hope and prayer that the program of simple and direct Evan elism may be so increased that the Gospel may be carried to all the people for whose evangelization we are responsible.

"That in this hour when the world's need of Christ is so manifest and desperate, when the opportunities are so great, and new doors of entrance are opened into lands like Afghanistan, which have been hitherto closed, when young men and women are offering themselves freely for service, when our Missionaries and Churches with which they are uniting are eager for a great advance, when the problems of men and of nations and of races cry out, consciously or unconsciously, for Christ as their only solution, when the experience of the past year his revealed answ to the Church the adequate resources which are available to faith and love through the grace of God, this Assembly here and now dedicates itself and calls upon the Church to consecrate herself afresh to a new obedience to the last command of our Glorified Lord and to a full acceptance of His leadership in the supreme task of making the Gospel known to all mankind and of establishing His Kingdom over all the world."

3. You describe the impression which you say is made upon the minds of Princeton Seminary students by their conferences with representatives of our Foreign Board. The two representatives of ur Board wit, whom the students have most contact are members of the faculty of Princeton Seminary and the full evangelical loyalty of their personal convictions has, I think, not been questioned. It has on the other hand been vouched for repeatedly by the Board of Directors and is trusted throughout the Church. As to the Candidate Department of the Board the best evidence of its attitude is in its acts. It has not recommended the declination or discouragement of a single Princeton Seminary student because of doctrinal convictions. The only specific case which you cite, of the young man recently who had been working in the Continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada, met with no discouragement whatever. He was a most desirable candidate, and was at once and joyfully appointed.

know and have experienced the Gospel of the New Testam nt, and who are able and ready to go out to preach by word and life "the lorious Gospel of the blessed God in the fullness of its lew Testament meaning. So far from discouraging such men, the Board is eagerly seeking for them. And when they are found they are counselled to stand fast in the Scriptural faith and to go forth to proclaim the message of the Gospel in all their life and work and teaching. You say there is no clear evidence of this. On the other hand I think there is clear evidence in the instructions given in the annual conference with new missionaries and otherwise. For a single example I refer you to Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Post War Conference of the Board and all the Lissions, entitled, "The Cospel of Paul."

4. You say that your impression of misgivin, and distrust is strengthened by the blank which is sent to those whose names the candidate for missionary anpoirtment gives as references, and you single out for criticism from the fifth item of character and equipment which are mentioned these three - "tolerance of the point of view of others," "desire to progress in spiritual truth," and "sanity", explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views." Surely you camot mean to imply that these are undesirable qualities in Christian missionaries. There are. to be sure, limits to tolerance, just as to some other virtues, and it is not always easy to fix those limits. In your book on "The Origin of Paul's Religion" you carry as a scholar with great urbanity, the limits of tolerance of the point of view of others far beyond the point where anyone would dream of carrying them in cooperation with missionary service, but there would be nothing but pure separate individualism, as you have recognized in your books, if we were not prepared to work together within the evangelical fellowship in tolerance of the point of view of others. The question of the blank, as Mr. Hadley pointed out to you, covers simply that. And this Charles Hodge defended and advocated at the meeting of the Evan elical Alliance in New York in 1873 and Dr. Patton has nobly set forth in "Fundamental Christianity" and Dr. E. D. Warfield has emphasized in his Minority Report to the General Assembly of 1929 when, referring to our troubles at Princeton Seminary, he says, "In my judgment the root and ground of the difficulties are embodied in p rsonalities, and so far as they are not embodied in personalities, they are embodied in the lack of that tolerance which we so stron ly claim for ourselves and so generally deny to other." The question on the ref sence blank involves no more and nothing different from this - to ability of Christian men who nold the evangulical convictions or our Church to work to etn r in harmon; and good will and mutual tolerance.

and as to "desire to progress in spiritual truth' - t at is one if the olearest admonitions of the New Testament: "row in the race and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' "Long for the spiritual milk which is without guile that a may grow thereby unto salvation." "To walk northily of the Lord unto all pleasing, pearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." and how many more passages. It is men and women who long and strive for the fulfilment of these possibilities in their own lives who are wanted in Christian service at home and abroad.

and "sanity' earning "absence of tendenc; to extreme views.' Certainly the opposit of these qualities is not desirable. On carefully in your books do you guard against certain extreme views regarding the millennial hope, regarding mysticism, regarding extreme intellectualism and extreme experimentalism, and many of its. And how earnestly Paul counsels men: "Let your mode ation, your forbearance be known unto 11 men." "God gave us a spirit of power and love and of a sound mind." "Soburness' is one of his emphasized virtues and Peter's, too. "Be ye therefore sober and watch unto prayer." " erefore irding up to loins

J. Gresham Nachen 4/30/29

of your mind, be sober and set your hope perfectly on the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." This is true sanity, the sanity desired in minnionaries. (Cf. Gal. V. 23, II Peter I.6.)

And note the place of these questions and their relationship to other questions in the blank. "Tolerance of the point of view of others" is part of the eighth general subject. "teamwork qualities." Four are mentioned, as follows: "a. Tact. b. Tolerance of the point of view of oth rs. c. left-control. d. Flexibility. (Subordination when best of one's own ambitions and preferences.)" The tenth subject of inquiry is "Spiritual qualities" and the subheads are: "a. Christian character. b. Vital religious experience. c. Spiritual influence on others." The eleventh subject is "Promise of Development in the Christian Life" and the subheads are: "a. Desire to progress in spiritual truth. b. Eagerness for Christian service. c. Sanity. (Absence of tendency to extreme views)." Then follow questions as to the experience of the candidate in various forms of practical work and Christian service.

To twist these simple and reasonable and wise questions and to freight them with suspicion is an untrue and unjust note in your paper.

- 5. You say that in the "Candidate Reference Blank" "there is not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his int llectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the Gospel." That is covered (1) by the constitutional requirements of the Church with regard to the examinations of ordained candidates by their Presbyteries which are reported to the Board. (Frequent actions of the General Assembly have dealt with this matter of the functions of Mission Boards and Presbyteries in this regard. The question as respects the Fergian Board was passed upon by the Board and by the General Assembly in 1902 when Dr. . M. Paxton and Dr. Robert Russell Booth and Dr. John Fox, who were then members of the Board, were particularly concerned in the decisions reached, and in 1895, 1910 and 1921. (2) By the three questions to which most space is given and which are deemed the most important questions on the "Candidate Reference Blank", namely, "Would you recommend appointment?" "If not, what would seem to be the weak points or faults which in your judgment should disqualify one a plicant from foreign mission work?" "Unhampered by any questions, please state frankly your own opinion as to the general fitness of the candidate for the work of a foreign missionery?" (3) By the inclusion in the Personal Application Blank filled out by every layman and woman candidate of the four Constitutional mestions propounded by Presbyteries to candidates for ordination. (4) By the tollowing questions: "What is your habit in devotional Bible study and prayer?" "Do you believe that in ev.ry form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord and Master?" "Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your missionary service, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?"
- (5) By requiring from very candidate, ordained and unordained, a separate letter. The requirement is thus expressed on all application blanks:

"WRITE A SEPARATE LET ER giving in brief: "a) a sketch of your life; (b) Your Christian development and experience: (c) Your motives in seeking missionary appointment; (d) The content of your Christian Mossage."

who is not under care and examination of a Presbytery:

## "The Content of your Christian Message.

This question is vital. You propose to go to a foreign land in order to propagate the Christian religion, either by public address, or by personal contacts, or by both. It is of utmost importance that you should have a clear idea of what this religion is. Any positive statements upon Christian faith and practice which you wish to make should be set forth here, and will naturally include your idea of God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the redemptive work of Christianity, duties to your fellowmen, the Bible, the Church, together with such otherleading truths as you would expect to embody in your message. Such condensation is desired as may be consistent with a satisfactory setting forth of your views."

Possibly you may never have seen this last state ent. It has been in use for the past six years.

In the light of these statements I think your criticism of the blanks is untrue and unjust.

6. You criticize also the question on the application blank with regard to the ability of the candidate to "Cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your (his) own opinion," and you are dissatisfied with Dr. Hadley's explanation that this does not refer to theological convictions but to capacity to work with others happily in attending to our main common business and in pursuing our definite and united aim even though there may be differences of opinion over questions of method and policy and judgment, and other things too. Such ability to work with others is certainly important. In the Shantung Mission in China there were three strong personalities - Dr. Nevius, Br. Matter and Dr. Corbett. These men were wide apart in their opinions as to missionary policy and method, but they were able to adjust themselves and to establish and carry forward one of the best missions of our Church. Mr. Hadley was right in interpreting this question in this sense, as raising not the issue of evangelical theological views, which are the expected basis of missionary appointment, but "the question of temp rement and ability to work in fullest harmony with people in the small group which is usually found in a mission station."

The question on the application blank is an old, old question. It has been used for many years; in its present form for the past seven years. It has never had any reference to theological views. They are covered, as I have pointed out, in other ways.

7. You criticize also the two questions which emphasize the "paramount duty" and "the chief aim" of each missionary "to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord and Laster." Eurely this is just what the Church wants to be assured of in its foreign missionaries, that everyone of them will set the spiritual, evan elistic purpose in the first place and, as the Board's Manual says, will make "all methods and forms of missionary service contribute to the realization of this aim." I shall refer later to your rejection of this state ent of the missionary aim but I would refer how, though I shall refer again also to this, to your statement that the use in these questions of the terms "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" it "studiedly vaque." That statement is both untrue and unjust. It is the kind of statement regarding your Christian brethren which both the Scriptures and the Standards of our Church forbid. I use the term "Faviour" and "Lord" and "Master", and my associates use them

and they are used by the Board in these questions in the same sense, in the full sense, in the sincere and explicit sense in which they are used in the ospils, in the Book of Acts, in the Epistles and in the Revelation - in that sense and in no other. If you think that they are not adequate or that they are "studiedly vague" your controversy is with the N w Testament whose meaning and authority in this and in all things I unreservedly accept and with whose very works I am content.

8. You refer to the fact that on May 0, 1928, "no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the foreign Board "were signers of the 'Auburn Affirmation', and that four of the five in the case of the Foreign Board are still members of the Board and that Mr. Hadley, the present Candidate Secretary of the Board, was also a signer, though at the time he signed he had not become a secretary of the Board. If I were a minister I would not have signed the "Auburn Affirmation". Nor ould I sign any other except the great affirmation of our Confession: "The Supreme Judge can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the criptures."

I have, however, just re-read the "Affirmation" and note to following positive declaration:

"Te affirm and declare our acceptance of the estmineter Confession of Faith, as we did at our ordination, 'as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures.' e sincerely hold and earnestly preach the doctrines of syangelical Christianity, in agreement with the historic testimony of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, of alch we are loyal ministers....

"e all hold most earnestly to those reat facts and doctrines (i.e. te inspiration of te Biole, and to Inc reation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and te Continuin, Life and Supernatural Power of our Lord Jesus Christ); e all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible we impired of God; that Jesus Christ was dod manifest in the flesh; that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto mimself, and through Him we have our redemption; that having died for our sine He rose from the dead as is our eviluating Saviour; that in his earthly ministry He wrought many mighty works, and by His vacarious death and unfailing presence He is able to save to the Uttermost."

In their positive affirmation sur ly these en are as muc satisfied to be trusted and believed as you and I think we are, and if I understand t all the positions and principles of Dr. Charles Hodge and Dr. Patton to be is basis here for righteous C ristian cooperation.

9. The econd part of your paper is devoted to my "utterances" as a cause or disquist regarding the Foreign Board." And the terms of your letter and the expressed suspicions and implied charges of your statement are a summons to self-defense. I have been associated with the foreign mission work of our Church in our Board for thirty-eight years. I have tried to serve faithfully and efficiently and I do not think the service needs to be vindicated to men. The is a Master whom you and I are both trying to serve and His judgment is the only judgment which need much cone rn us, and you and I are both clearly known to him. But one is glad of the opportunity to bear His Christian witness to our Glorious Lord and His tospel and to seek to relieve the foreign mission caus, to which long a o I gave m, whole life from the suspicions and distrust him you think my utterances have brount upon it.

The chief ground of complaint and criticism in your statement with regard to me relates to the little book "Are Foreign Missions Done For?" and its statement of the aims of foreign missions. Insumuch as this statement of aim is quoted in the book from the Board's Manual, where it has stood in its present form for many years, I am glad to retire for a time, with the little book, into the background and shall take up your attack on the statement of the Missionary aim, to which also reference was earlier made. The statement which you criticize is as follows:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting and self-governing; to cooperate, so lon, as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ,"

You object to this as "evasive and vague" and because it does not explicitly "declare the absolute necessity for every missionary of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernaturnal return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

In reply I would say: (1) This statem nt of the supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions was prepared in its present form by a committee of the Post War Conference of the Board with representatives of the Missions held at Princeton in June 1920. The chairman of this committee was the Rev. J. alter Lowrie, D.D., of China, later secretary of the Bible Union of China. It was he who helped to form this statement, which the Conference unanimously adopted for just what it was intended to be, no more and no less. It was not a statement of the doctrinal content of the Gospel message. It was the briefest possible declaration of the central purpose of missions with due subordination of its various elements. That central purpose most assuredly is to make known our ford Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world. (2) The statement is absolutely and taithfully Scriptural. It gathers together the words and thoughts of the Gr at Commission in its various forms: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, sayin, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Chost," "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to ev ry creature." "and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

All your criticisms of the aim as stated are equally applicable, some of them more so, to the last commands of our Lord. These commands do not mention the things you require to have mentioned. They do contain certain ideas which you disapprove. Your vie s explain away and even attack the clear meaning and the very words of the great Commission as Matthew records it.

(3) You summarize jour criticism of the statement of aim by saying "In short, there is no hint hero that the foreign missionary has a measage to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the ord of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the

precious blood of Christ." I think that any fair and candid Christian mind will find not only a hint of these things but far more than a hint in the plain, honest words of the aim if honorably and fair mindedly construed. These and other elements of the Gospel would be included in a statement of the content of the message which the missionary is to make known, but they do not naturally or essentially fall in a sentence-statement of the central and controlling aim. That him is to make our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, known to the world. Paul writes to the Ephesians, "Unto me who am less than the least of all saints was this grace given to preach unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Some of those riches he proceeds to unfold but by no means all, and he makes no mention of some of the particulars in which, of course, he believed but all of which he never attempted to summarize in any statement of his central, single missionary purpose.

I think you make three great mistakes here, (1) You confuse the statement of the aim of missions to proclaim the Gospel of Christ with the statement of the content of the message of the Gospel. (2) You allow your suspicion and distrust of others, your judging as you would not be judged, to deflect and poison your viewmen you call Jesus Christ "Lord and Master" you say the words are used honestly, but when I call Him so, the words are used dishonestly. This is "untrue and unjust." It is more than that. Paul says explicitly, "No man can say Jesus is Lord but in the Holy Spirit." You appear flatly to dispute Paul and to believe that men can call Jesus Lord by the evil spirit. Our Lord spoke some stern words about this kind of judgment. (3) You unmistakably imply that the failure specifically to mention certain great doctrines is evidence that those doctrines are not believed.

10. I will go on to deal specifically with this point. You say that "the vagueness which characterizes this utterance (i.e., the statement of aim) also characterizes the whole booklet, (i.e., "Are Foreign Missions Done For?") There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed, no mention of Scripture as such at all) no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ."

Before examing this statement and the implications which you put into it and the inferences which you draw out of it, I wish to make my position unmistakably clear. I am an evangelical Christian believer. I accept all the facts, all the doctrines, all the truths of the New Testament. I stated my convictions summarily in an article in the International Review of Missions, October 1923, on "Missionary Cooperation in Face of Doctrinal Difference", as follows:

"Before attempting to asswer these questions, the writer of this paper ought perhaps, in order to avoid all misunderstanding, to state his own point of view. He accepts the whole of Christianity as set forth in the New Testament. He believes unqualifiedly every article of the Apostles' Creed. No language is adequate to state his conception of Christ. He believes that he is more and greater than any words can ever express, 'the Wire made flesh,' God incarnate, reconciling the world to Himself, the only Saviour our Lord and our God. He pelieves in the truthfulness of the record of Christ's life, including His miracles, and rejoices with great joy in the miracle of the Virgin Birth and of the real Resurrection of Christ and of Hisfuture

personal advent. He believes that it is God alone who through Christ saves men, not by their characters, nor by any works of righteousness which they can do, but by Mis own grace through the death and life of His dear Son. As to the Bible, he accepts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession and regards its authority as supreme, not in faith only but also in the practice, conduct and religions of men. I am afraid this may seem to many very antiquated and unmodern, and the writer must be prepared to accept whatever limitations of value in the modern mind such views set upon his judgment as to the doctrinal limits of tolorance and the doctrinal basis of cooperation."

As to our Lord, I spoke fully and definitely in the Moderator's sermon at the General Assembly in 1928. I am no theologian and I did not and cannot speak in terms of systematized theology (which I respect and believe to be necessary) but I believe in the Saviour and His glory and His redeeming work as deeply and truly and lovingly as you can believe in Him. I tried to say this at the Assembly in Tulsa. These were some of the works I used:

"There is nothin, good or great that we will not say about Jesus. There is no claim that we will not make for Him. There is naught that we can say about God that we will not say also about Jesus, 'the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins; who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation: for in him were all thin, s created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is above all things. and in Him all things consist. And He is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things He might have the preeminence, For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace throu h the blood of His cross: through Him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens. '

""e will say about Jesus all that all the creeds have said and then we will say that He is more than this. All that men have said or even can say about His glory, His beauty, His power, His deity we will say. He is all this and He transcends all this. Here let us stand each for himself and all of us as Christ's Church and henceforth let no men trouble us for we bear in our mind and in our heart, in our spirit and in our body the marks of Lord Jesus."....

"But all words fall short of the r ality with re ard to Christ. If He were nothing but a oou dead man who spoke and wrought as wisely as He knew long ago in Palestine, who died bravely on a cross with no hate of those who did such hateful wrong, and over whose undisturbed rave the Lyrian stars look down, then we should have much scruple lest we should wrong His memory with excess speech. Indeed I no ago we should have found the adequate words to describe his humanity. But to us Jesus Christ is not a good dead man but God, the living God, our Risen and Living Caviour, and we will use all the language we have and deem it simple and poor to utter the wonder that is beyond all utterance.

"Nevertheless we can make our confession.
We confess Him in the august symbols of our historic creeds and confessions."

You may not call these vague and evasive" words. You may not call them, as you do call the sincere and earnest utterances of our mission ries and of the secretaries of our Board, "perfunctory lip service." If you do, you will have to answer before our Lord and Judge; nay you will receive even now in your mind and enaracter tod's inevitable penalty upon such un-Christian and UnChristlike judgment of a man on his fellow Christians. Let us both be mindful of our aster's words. (Matt. VII. 1-4).

ow let us examine this present criticism. (1) You say that my little book does not mention the Virgin Birth and its place in Christian faith. That is true. Neither is it mentioned in your book on The Origin of Paul's Religion." You there set forth the details of Jesus' life ...ich were known to faul but you make no mention amon, them of the Virgin Birth. The single mention of it in your book "that is Raith?" is in the question which is asked in a purely incidental and secondary way, " nat has it (i.e. simple trust lik that of the Centurion) to do with a uestion of fact line the question of the Virgin Birth? (p.91). You to on on this same page to state what we med to know about Jesus. You do not mention the Virgin sirth. Those two books are serious and competent treological tudies. One might expect to find clear mention in them, especially in discussion of "that is Faith?" of all that the writer deemed essential. You omit the Virgin irth in tiese studies of the content of Paul's Gospel and of the Ciristian faith and then condemm m/ poor little booklet on our forei n mis.ion duty because I do not mention a truth mich I had no occasion to mention here but which I joyfully b live and have set forth elsewhere at greater length and particularity than I have seen or neard of in any writin s of yours.

And are you prepared to condema every book that does not set forth the Virgin Birth of our Lord and of absolute necessity of belief in it for all Christian preachers and teachers? Dr. Patton has written a noble book on "Fundamental Christianity. Surely he will deal with the Virgin Birth h re as you require. Does he? Not once does he mention it save incidentally in the

mention of the Virgin Mary and the Roman doctrine of the Emmaculate Conception. In Dr. A. A. Hodge's "Popular Lectures on Theological Themes" there is, if I am not mistaken, a single reference to the Virgin Mary and not a word about the theological significance of the Virgin Birth. Even in the three great volumes of Charles Hodge's "Systematic Theology" the index does not mention "Virgin Birth." It refers only to Roman ideas of the Virgin ary. And in the text the fact and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth receive almost no attention. Under "Particular Passages which teach the Divinity of Christ" no reference is made to the Virgin Birth. Under the Person of Christ there are a few references to it, chiefly relating to the human nature in Jesus and the substance of His body. There is no reference whatever to the place of the Virgin Birth in the Christian message nor any such treatment of its theological significance as one finds, for example, in Du Bose's "Boteriology of the New Testament."

Do not misunderstand me. I believe in the Virgin Birth and I regard it, in Dr. George Alexander's words, as "a peculiarly precious truth." And I know that of course Dr. Patton believes it. But the idea that failure to mantion it implies disbelief and that every book which omits it is unevangelical, is untrue and irrational. Consider the result of the application of your requirements here to the volume entitled "Biblical and Theological Studies by the Faculty of Princeton of the Founding of the eminary" (1912). It is a great volume of 634 pages. Here, surely, one would feel that he had a right to expect a full statement of the Gospel which the leminary was established to teach, a presentation of the essential and fundamental teaching of Christianity, setting forth with special clearness the Christian message Dr. Patton in his opening paper says, "my theme embrases the for our time. entire circle of theological learning." Your criticism of our statement of aim is that it is not enough to speak of the circle; all the contents of the circle must be explicitly spoken of also and you name contain contents whose verbal omission is proof of unevange. Well, let us see. This nuge and sincere theological volume contains not a single reference to the Virgin Birth. The one reference to the second coming of Christ is in a paper by Dr. Brdman. That is the only one. There is a paper on "Sin and Grace in the Korsn" but none on "Sin and Grace in the Gospel." There is a "study of Jonathan Edwards" and another of "The Aramaic of Daniel" and another of "The Shepherd of Hermas" but none of "the truthfulness of the Scriptures", of "the new birth of believers" of "justification by faith", of "the atoning death of Christ." hat if one should use your own words: " hat sort of a Gospel is it from which all that makes a dospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away but so is the glory and the power." Those words might far more justly be used here than with regard to my little missionary book. This is a great theological presentation of the Gospel offered in commemoration of a century's life of a great school

whose business it is to set forth the content of the Gospel. But I will not use your words. I think the volume is a worthy Christian production and one of the best things in it is the passage in your paper, where, more adequately than any where else, you recognize (p.575) the Pauline doctrine of the Resurrection. And I think its omissions are justified on the ground on which you justify omissions in Paul's Epistles, namely, "It is omitted not because it is unimportant out on the contrary because it is fundamental," (p.562). I think that is a valid justification of these "Biblical and Theological Studies" with their vast omissions. I think it is valid in the case of many omissions in your books. ill you not be equally fulr-minded toward others?

- (a) You say there is "no mention of the bodily resurrection" in my little book. The Resurrection is mentioned more than once and by that I mean the bodily Resurrection of our Lord, but I did not use the phrase. Neither have you used it in a single one of your three books which I have read. And it is not used in the New Testament. The New Testament is content to speak of the resurrection, meaning the real and actual Resurrection of our Lord and I am content with the language of the New Testament. And as to the reality of the bodily Resurrection of our Lord I hold with Paul that it is the supreme fact and truth in Christianity.
- (3) You say there is "no mention of the full truthfulness of scripture, (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all)." Again you are mistaken. The sible, the New Testament, the Word of God, are all mentioned repeatedly. The full truthfulness of scripture is everywhere assumed. I accept joyfully, and we expect each missionar, to accept, the doctrine of our Standards with regard to the Scriptures. But I must honestly say that there is something which appears to be not altogether candid, I will not say "evasive", in your own references to the inspiration of the Scriptures. One notes the care with which you refrain from facing certain issues and from using the language of some of those whom you allow to think that you agree with them. And do you or do you not agree with Dr. Patton's position in "Fundamental Christianity"?
- (4) You say there is 'no mention of the supernatural return of Carist',
  Two of your three books wase no mention of it. I find no mention of it in E.A.
  Hodge's "Popular Lectures." As for me I have cherished this faith and hope for
  forty-two years. My cophood ministers, one a graduate of Princeton Seminary and all
  the orthodox of the orthodox, spiritualized this truth completely out of the Bible
  but I learned it at the Northfield Conference when I was a Sophomore in college and I
  have lived with it and in it ever since and have gladly borne some reproach because
  of it. I wrote a little book on it if it was again and again preached it. I
  think I have borne ten times the witness to it which you have borne. But it did
  not seem to me to be necessary to introduce it into this little defense of missions.
  I was writing to defend foreign missions against their enemies. I did not realize
  that they would need to be defended from their friends.
- of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ." You qualify this by recognizing "one bare mention of the Crucified and ever-living Lord." hat would you think of the spirit of the statement that there was "one bare mention of the Virgin Birth" and "one bare mention of revelation' in "hat is Faith?" But again you are mistaken. Those truths are either stated or implied or assumed in my booklet.

  More than this was not called for in the nature and purpose of the little book. It

was not an attempt to set forth the content of the Christian message. It was simply a short and earnest presentation of the claim that Christ is the only and the Sufficient Saviour.

11. The claims of Christ are not kept in the background. The little book is full of their assertion. It maintains, throughout, the sole sufficiency and universality of the Gospol: "Christ needs nothing from any one. No oth r religious teacher has any contribution to make to Him. In him dwells all the fulness or the Godhead. He is the final and sufficient revelation of God and the only Saviour and Redsemer of man. This is the New Testament representation. It is the solid and unalterable foundation of foreign missions. Foreign missions are not a search for a new and better religion. They are not an attempt to find something that is not already in Christ. They are the effort of those who have heard of Christ to take what they have heard to the whole world in order that all men together may learn more of him." (p. 56). It conceives Christ, as the scriptures do, as "the unconscious Desire of the Nations, the one answer to all the problems of the soul of man, his one Saviour and his only hope. A fundamental conviction for our Church in the work at home and abroad is this conviction that it has in Christ the sufficient Cospel. The Church is not looking for a new and different Cospel. It has found the one and only Saviour." "The Christian faith is a truth and a treasure greater than any other that we possess. It is our duty to share it and to suppose to all men everywhere to take it as their own. It is theirs by the same title that makes it ours and there are depths in it which will only be found as we explore them together apprehending with all saints, as alone we can, the full dimensions of the love of God. and all attaining, as the only way in which any of us can attain, the unity of the faith and the stature of the fulness of Christ. The truth that we need to keep in view and that it is easy to for set, is that Christ is greater than all our thoughts about Him and that as the whole world comes to know Him and to accept His Lordship new glories hitherto not seen in Him will appear. But these lories are in Christ. they are not in the religions or racial cultures of Asia. and the revelation of them will not come from those religions or cultures. It will come from Christ as the result or a larger relief by mankind in Him and a larger application of His grace and power to human life throughout the world. This is the lesson we need to remember. Our ideas about Christ may be true as far as they go, but they do not go far enough. We may not hold that they are complete. But Christ is complete. In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." (p.42). "Christ is absolute and final and He and His religion are to prevail absolutely and finally.". "It is Christ that we Christians owe to all men here and throughout the world. If this position be regarded as marrow and fanatical, then we must accept such condemnation. Only we are sure that the same judgment must apply to the whole doctrine of the New Testament. The coreign missions enterprise recorded there rested upon precisely this view of one uniqueness and sufficiency of Christ. The early Church believed that there was none other name given among men whereby they must be saved. All men everywhere needed Christ and Christ was enough. Meither Greek, nor Roman, nor semitic religion had any correction to make or any supplement to add to Him. And the modern foreign missions enterprise stands on the same ground. It is the endeavor to make Christ known to all mankind, that all mankind together may live in Him and find in him more and preater treasures than and one race or any one soul can find alone. Each race and eace soul for itself can find in Him all that it knows that it needs, but only mankind altogether will discern the full depths of human want and the infinite fulness of Christ's supply. He is adequate indeed to the full needs of each soul only because He is the whole world's sufficient Saviour;

'In Him is life provided For all mankind and me.'

"I would rejoice to se the missionary enterprise brought in our day more clearly and lovally and uncomplainingly than ever to those fundamental ideas with which it began, and to see it disentangled, as far as we can disentangle it, from a great many of the compromising fellowships in which it finds itself, and released to do its pure, elementary, rational work down at the foundations of human life in relating men one by one to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour." (p. 102) " grant anat a man's judgment here will depend altosether on what his estimate is of Jesus Christ. If Jesus Christ means nothing to him, why, he will not see any necessity on the part of other men for knowing about Him. But if Jesus Christ is all there is for us, 11 we know that he is all there is, then we cannot out recognize the inherent obligation in wealth like that to be stared with all who have not yet come into its possession. (p.108) "The missionar, enterprise is the proclamation of the One Name liven under Heaven amon, men whereby we must be saved, and there is nothing in any non-Christian religion to be added to the glory of Christ or to the fulness of the revelation of Christ, howevit we so imperfectly apprehend it still. Inside the Christian spirit burns the old resolution that glowed in St. Paul's heart to whom it would have been 'woe', if he had not shared the Christ he knew. , ould that we might get back again to the foreign missionary enterprise in the pure, maked spiritual reality of it, as Christ called that little group of men and women around him at the first, who had no nations back of them, who were not joing to speak for any race. They were just a little group of individuals whom Christ had redeemed and who knew their Redeemer, and he tola them to oo out and snare what they had in Him with all the world. That is what the mis lonary enterprise has always been. That is what it is today. - Carlatianity stripped of all accessories and secondary accourrement, just Christ, Hamself, to be offered to the whole world for which He died." (0. 141).

These are only a few expressions from this little book. It is a poor little thing but it is not the vague and evaslve and unevangelical thing you allege. And of the numbers of evangelical men and women who have written or socken about the book you are the only one of whom I have heard who condemns it. One of the warmest and most grateful of the letters of commendation is from an old frie of Tr. Albertus Pieters, of Holland, Michigan, as conservative in his theology as you/tan ever hope to be. There is enough evidence in sheaves of letters at hand that the little book has nortified evangelical conviction and contirmed true missionar devotion. I will not quote them — yet I will quote from several that you may know the feeling of some not one whit less zealous than you:

"I have just finished the reading of your book, so xiddly sent to me, entitled 're forein lissions Dode For?' It is no after twelve o'clock p.m. I cannot express to you the joy I received in readin it. After having much of my former zeal for missions dampened by recent post graduate studies in the University of and the coldness in the churches that I have tried to interest in a feeble way, I ro rededicate myself anew to the task of missions and resolve to do my best to give ind stimulate giving in the little church I a called to serve.
"I can fully appreciate the difference between 'The religion of the good dead man' and the 'Religion of a cod livin Co'.""

<sup>&</sup>quot;On the day that your little book 'me Foreign hissions Done For?'
case to as, I read it and decided to write you at once in re and to a
further distribution of it. I probably felt that you know your own
business, but in the light of some college periodicals recently received
I know my first impulse was right.
'I would like to have the whole tune, o periods only the chapter

'Christ is Enough' printed for large distribution among our college organizations."

"The more I read t.1. volume the more I m impressed with its value and importance, coming especially at this ti. It is the golest defense or justification or roleign is ions t at has yet been sent forth. It will be sure to strengthen those who are faltering and win over those who are catale or who is elucewarm and indifferent. The great head of the church must have put it into your heart to write it and I am sure will use it in stirring the whole Church ap to a renowed sense of its reat responsibility in regard to the whole matter."

"For quite a long time I have wanted to wrive to you. After reading your recent sooklet, 'the Foreign missions Done for' I cannot refrain from writing. I and to thank you with all my heart for the stand and the message in that booklet. Fundamentally, while defending the foreign mission movement from modine criticism, it is a call back to the original notive of foreign missions. I round typelf in complete agreement ich every page of the book.'

"I have just read 'ne Far in Ni. ions lone For?' at 'ne sitter and I can't conist anym ho, wonderful it is. so my mind it is the most anamswerable ar ument I have ever seen. I do hope somebody is living it wide circulation. There is no much loose talk going about, even mone replained better, about one religion completing or complementing another. You are right, Christian ty needs no completion - it is complete - it needs discover.

theading this some full trule book of your I feel convenced that on still stand firm or and old reliable faith once delivered unto the circle.

Mistatt is from the tomrch of the hutheren prethren. I am attamed to have justed these. I dare to use raul's words: "I am become foolish; ye have compensed me.

I have written quite enough and more than ought to have been required. I could answer come of your criticisms of quoting from your own books the statement of the very truths for wrich jou condemn me. There are two things more of which I shall speak(1) the first it this: I find myself in deep and thankful accord with almost all or your great convictions. I am full of admiration and ratitude for "The Origin or Paul's religion" and agree with you in your emphasis on the historicity and supernaturalness of the facts of Christianity's regiming and the necessity of the great Christian doctrines undetachable from these facts, on the need of reasoned doctrinal statement and defense, on the reat doctrines of sin and faith, on the reson of Christ, on miracles, on C ritianity as a message as well as an experience and a life, and I mit to on with a long list of all the evangelical convictions. The I differ from you is at the points where, as it seems to me, ou differ from the Periptures. The great caripture truths you is note or qualify. You twest or interpret som passages out of their plain and obvious state ont. You use nor-criptural, even

anti-Scriptural forms of thou ht and expression. When apparently contradictory ideas of statements are found in the New Testament you modify one or the other or both to lit your scheme of thou ht instead of accepting them both just as they are without qualification as parts of larger truth or life which comprehends them both without any minimization. You do no justile to Paul's moral and social applications of the Gospel and you even indulge in a fling at some ministers who read the sixth chapter of Ephesians to their people. There are illustrations in your paper which we are considering. There you use some words in your statement of essential doctrine which are not found in the scriptures at all. I can state my convictions wholly in the very words of the Scriptures. You use repeatedly the phrase "the sospel of the Cross". his phrase as not in the Scriptures. The I . Testament knows 'the Gospel', "the cospel of Christ", "the Gospel of the Kingdom", "the Gospel of peace," "the cospel of God," "the everlasting Gospel," but it nownere uses the phrase "t e Gospel of the Cross" and the use which you make of that phrase implies interpretations both of the idea of the "Gospel" and of the idea of the Cross which do not do justice to the full New Testament teaching. The Gospel is not the Gospel of the Cross only, not even of the Cross of Christ only. The cospel is the Gospel of Christ which includes the Cross and what preceded the Cross and what followed the Cross. The same defect marks your use of the idea of "salvation only by the Gross," and your criticisa of my reference to the "redseming life" of Christ. Your view certainly does not do full justice to the coriptures nor does it represent the true Spriptural proportion of truth. You say in "mat is Faith?" 'Christ touches our lives, according to . . New Testament through the Cross. (p.145 But compare Heb: II,18; IV., 15, 16) "The Cross of Christ is the special basis of Christian faith'. (n.144-But compare I.Cor. N. 17,. "The Cross of which salvation was wrought." (your stat: .e.it; But compare .top. 1.16, V.10). You do not and cannot too much exalt the Cross o' Christ, but you can and you do fail to set it in its Scriptural place and clationship and you reglect to relate it adequately to the full truth o: the New Pestament. You do not give their full Perintural place to the Incarnetion prior to the Cross or to the Rour' tion and on other aspects of the full truth of the Gosper. You justry emphasize the fact of the learning the ics evidential significance but ou do not adequately set forth its relation to the redomin work of Christ, its place in our salvation, or its prictical and dynamic significance in the life of the believer at the level at he sets forth all these aspects. You do indeed in brief references couple the Cross and the Resurrection in their relation to salvation. In " nat is Flith?" you speak of "the Gospel of redemption through the Cross and resurrection of Christ' (p.p. 104,151). Also "The Urigin or Paul's Religion," p.167. In view of your criticism of my use once of the word "spirit" with a sall s", ore notes that you habitually write "cross' and sometimes of late, thou h not earlier, Virgin Birth with a capital and "resurrection without it.) But you criticize my truly Scriptural reference to the "reduceming "life" of Christ (Hom. VI., 1-11; VII:4; VILLEI-I4).

The New Testament teaching is far richer and freer than your view appears to be. It teaches not that the Cross saves us or that we are saved by the Cross. It teaches that Christ saves us, and that He saves us by Himself, by His death and by His life. How rich is Paul's orientation and proportion of these truths. But dod commendeth his love toward us, in that, wille we were yet simmers, Christ fied for us. Buch more then, being no justified by his blood, we stall be saved from wrath through His. For if, wen we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his ten, much more, being reconciled, we stall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by anom we have no ric ived the atonement." (Rom. V., 8-II). Let any ne take his new Testament and read it through,

marking every reference to the Cross and the death of Christ and every reference to the Resurrection and the life of Christ and compare the result with the proportions of these glorious facts and doctrines in your emphasis. "Christ died for our sins" you quote often and you cannot quote too often. But only occasionally do you add "according to the Scriptures", and still leve fre wently do you complete the quotation and add "And he hath been raised on the third day according to the Sexiptures." Of course you believe this and rejoice in it, but you do not relate these truths as Paul does and you substitute the Cross which might have been without the Resurrection for the place of the Resurrection which included the Cross. The Cross without the Resurrection would not have saved us. Paul proceeds in this very chapter to declare in language which takes our br ath away: "If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins" (I. Cor. XV.17) And one might go on to speak of Peter's teaching of the relation of the Resurrection to repeneration and salvation. This full Gos, el of the New Testament is the glorious Gospel. I do not share your view that it can only be preached off naively. The Cross is indeed to many a stantling block. Paul and Pete. both realized and declared this. Paul also said: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God. Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved. Be ye imitators of me, even as I am of Christ. Giving no offense in anything, that the ministry be not clamed. But have renounced the hidden things of dishenesty, not welking in craftiness, nor handling the word of Cod deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." There is clearly in Paul's view a vast difference between the preaching of the offense of the Cross and the offensive preaching of the Cross. The word for "offence" which Paul uses in Gal. V. 11 and I. Cor. II., 23 and which Peter uses in I. Peter II.. 8 is the very same which Paul uses in Rom. XIV.. 13 and XV1..17, and which the Saviour uses in His dreadful warning in Luke XVII.1,2. and which in the American Standard Revised is translated in all these passages not "offence" or "offend", but "stumbling block" or "cause to stumble." It were well if we remembered these words in our Christian fellowship within and in our proclamation of Christ and His Cospel to those who are without: "Then said he unto the disciples. It is impossible but that offences will come; but woe unto him, through whom the come! It were better for him that a millstone were hanged apout his neck, and he east into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones." "Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way." I know that in the parallel passage in Matthew the words "little ones" are followed by the words "that believe in Me" but surely the Spirit of Christ would not have us think that the Tender Shepherd of His little ones, who left the ainsty and nine safe sheep in the fold to hunt the one that was lost, would be pleased with the thought that His disciples should measure their fidelity by their success in "offending". in "causing to stumble" to feet that are out of the way.

and a great deal more might be said of the failure of your books to set forth "the full scripture doctrine of the grace of God," to use your own phrase. But I do not suspect or reproach you as neretical or unevangelical. I believe that God and the Gospel and its grace are supernatural and infinite and if they are, while we may know them surely and truly, we may know, as Paul nimself says, only in part. But we are Christ's true disciples none the less, and we ought to love one another and walk together "comforted each of us by the other's faith", and making up each of us what is lacking in the other.

Perhaps you will be tempted to dismiss what I have just been saying as the simple, unsophisticated talk of one who is unschooled in theological systematization and no scholar in the field of theological controversy. It is even so. I do not pretend to be anything but a simple, Bible Christian who holds that under the grand liberty of our Confession he is free to believe all that he finds in the Scriptures as he finds it there and to reject whatever he sees which contradicts or deflects or malforms the rich and varied truth of the Scriptures. If anything that I say here or elsewhere is at variance with the Scriptures, if it declares what the Scriptures do not truly declare, or fails to declare what the Scriptures do truly declare, I shall be glad to have it shown and shall rejoicingly leave any error for the truth. Is this not evangelical?

Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified - not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board?" I do not like the slurring reference to the light which the sacrifice of life by men may help us to see in the divine fulness of the meaning of the death of Christ. But your question can be answered with an answer absolutely flat and clear. I ask you to read Dr. George Alexander's sermon at the Conference of the Board and the Missions in 1910 on "The Gospel of Paul." There the Gospel is described which the Board exists to spread abroad. The Foreign Board exists and its missionaries are appointed and maintained for one supreme purpose, namely, to proclaim to the world the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Incarnate, Crucified, Risen, Alive for Evermore, the Sinless One, the only Saviour, "who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen nor can see; to whom be honor and power eternal. Amen."

I said at the outset that I would speak finally of your paper as a whole. Perhaus, howev r, it is hardly necessary to do this except to say that the particular items of evidence which you have presented as justifying your negative answer to the query "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" appear to me to be inadequate and, as I have sought to show, so unfounded, that one wonders how a just and brotherly Christian view could have rested upon them so grave an inquiry and so grave a proposal as the establishment of a rival foreign missionary agency in our Church, independent of the General Assembly and supported by members of our Church who proclaim their fellow members to be unevangelical. And you rest this inquiry and this proposal on unwarranted impressions regardin a few questions on the "Reference Blank", a few thoroughly sensible and ri "t letters from Mr. Hadley in explanation, a criticism of a Soriptural statement of our missionary aim, a few random and detached quotations from thin s that I have written, a mass of your own suspicions, and arguments from silences which your oun books would not bear. My uttarances which you have quoted are, I believe, both true and Scriptural but you mi ht have quoted, if you had willed or known, a great mass of statements in addresses and books which you could not misuse as you have misused those in your paper. A man like you, devoted to scholar-ship, could not give his time to reading such simple books as mine, but they are loyal books, and to ir teaching has sou ht to be faithful to our Divine Lord and his Word.

The paper, as a whole, is as "Untrue and unjust" as it is in detail. It is not worthy of you or of the Gospel or of the fellowship or the Gospel. And I do earnestly trust that what I have said in this letter will lead ou to lay it aside, to dismiss your distrust and to join generously and faithfully in our great task of carrying to the non Christian people the Cospel of Christ, "the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God." And look at the real work before us here at home - in ignorance and unbelief, in slackness of moral and social standards, in sin and infidelity, in imperfection and unworthiness of faith and life in the Church, in the need of men everywhere for Christ. Contend for the faith within the Church but with equal zeal proclaim it to those who are without.

And now one more quotation from what you have written, not in this present statement of yours with its proposal of division and schism in our Church and its work, but in the closing paragraph of your book "Christianity and Liberalism."

"Is there no refuge from strife? Is there no place of refreshing where a man can prepare for the battle of life? Is there no place where two or three can gather in Jesus' name, to forget for to moment all those things that divide nation from nation and race from race, to forget human pride, to forget the passions of war, to forget the puzzling problems of industrial strife, and to unite in overflowing cratitude at the foot or the Cross? If there is be such a place, then that is the house of God and that the gate of heaven. And from under the threshold of that house will go firth a river that will revive the weary world."

Yes, this is the place. But once again we cannot stop at the Cross. Beyond that there was an empty tomb and a Risen and Livin Lord. "United with Him in the likeness of His Death", shall we not also be united with Him and therefore with one another "in the likeness of His Resurrection." Can we not, my friend, put away all this bitt mess and railing and suspicion and be kind and tender—hearted and trustful? And can we not be spared the sname and waste of such a baseless controversy as a controversy like this between you and me would be and give ourselves and all our strength to better and truer things. Is not Paul's counsel, "walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time," doubly applicable to our relationship and our work within the company of us who truly love and wish truly to serve our Common Lord?

If what I have written does not avail to persuade you and if you still think that it is your duty to publish your paper, surely it is only feir and right that my answer should be published with it. In that case I am prepared to meet my proportionate share of the expense. But, my dear friend, there is a more excellent way.

Very faithfully jours,

meky a., know

Sale Land Commission C

by last in lateral

a. The polyment of party or and the latest t countries of the hope and "projected by the hope of the hope of the hope and the hope of t solved as for early term of heat sources by the figure board and restrict out the delication. In Last organization in these on Fig. 2 was to make but and the bound from the Plant. The object purchase from more to. The fire restreen to take to ment promptly. It makes no year market as made for orders and Dealer of Parishing to the Stephen September 11 to up the steprovides of our largest the female on the Control for the largest regularization of AND REAL PROPERTY AND REAL PROPERTY. CO. LEWIS CO., LANSING MICHIGAN PROPERTY AND PARTY AND PERSONS. where they have the professions as they had been not been some entirely by the bown of are to life, as her recognition on the father, region the of the bester. It In fact, but has been been better the transplant on a provide early by some margin one may see was be to be been at more more over one out you any more as or having for the the way, my our man man about man about many to prove the class but In my parties and produced the party are to be the party by and appropriate or the first party and the Principles of few approach of the Sovjetters on half pates such and tick. In problem for himself receipt a feetles (100) all metions the six are as parameters arrived man or extent sentent, really THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF PERSONS ASSESSED AND ADDRESS OF PERSONS ASSESSED.

- - in the state of the state o the same of the sa s t t t s la l of the late and hear, and so relaterate surfaction on the season but become building to s rousib t of time of the second of the seco t - Lala - La Lala Cara - La Lala Ca world the will result, but the collection of the latest of the political states and the states of the state ly is large, the fire, and possibility of the state of th 1 1 . A 1 gold to the work that so the in the ti i straine du vice de la constante de la con ilivia de la companya t t y a t de la la company de film, litt little to the state of the state tile, or left contail, y or reservant the second of the CTA LA SE LA CALLE LA The state of the s rising the state of the state o t in i li ..

i tes or to real relation of the contract of t

one old it is a two west. It is relative 1 this ive as rim co, the rite: ro lift to to the older, learn to politicate, li , who of sent to XI va . Itl e latitude 1951 classics in the second of the second to we see in it. to tole to, just as contract, in the line of e sy to lx en lite. In , and a lite in the car, a a distribute and, a little in the oil a diduct byon 6s of the late and cort t i coo ruite, bit i sioner s vice, ul 't', ut ure s A LANGUAGE, IN O. THE POOL LESS IN JUST 16 , THE WAY TO CO chapty to the and this Committee of the confidence Us you died this a second of the base of the party of the base of the party of the base of L Taller of Child Ly and the County of the County myself to the Campail second, of line sees, converted to ear negative or returning in a property of the second se in the state of th the orange like a continuous of profession of the orange o T 10 20 1 - .

/2/2

ions in the blas. '.ol r = i he poi t · vie i thers i ·
th werl subject. t = k = aliti . see io .,
foite: 'a. P.ct. b. 'l = o th oin i of ...

on rol. . I visulity. ("bordination ... t o 'o ...

prie ences.) h tout! subject of impir i 'piritual iii
hewas are: . Unristin character. b. titul r li io x ...

c. irritual influence on oth rs." ine el v th maje t

out to g C. ristian life" and the subheads : ... i role

uni tr th. b. lagrance for Ouristian s rvic. c. iv. ( be here of
tennenc to extreme vi i.' ... rollo still s to ... and noe
cannidate in various form of receival r'' ... rice.

.o tist the e similar i reason bi in questions and to it is to succeed the contract of the con

- of You so to t in the land of the fraction of the land . ind a dight inveligable that a self is in a tunt cap sity; i. e i n tou word to net it it it on n to sper. It is covered (1) of the constitutional mir to of the it. reary to be an incline of ordered c. i the tracebyt 1 are rejulted to the ord. ( eq. 10 th of the ref. ly the with this ties of a ction of a lon . . . les in this n so tion was a last a far i or was on by to dan ral ly in 1 2 a . . . ton . . b t ll ooth .m or. John "Ox, a ser sen r J s it id thoulart one r in a d d d ion read d, la l'ab. lale la l. (a) hy to made but space i montald is a me the the total alle rerence tar , ly, "ould complete. It. the second and the confine the second and the secon g as a line to receive and over the state of t wir ally your opinion as to the mar far a o't mid te o sori i i (\*) , \*. l alu i uni uni uni indicated onto, some hard and comment of the in a late J still and viour. per ose to the the tar to do a of your issuer, service to the Ja to you "
- t in in the case of the state o

in it is a second of the secon

to a state a s

## · 18 -01 0 C Q F CE | FINAL PROPERTY |

Initio : vital. ropose of for inition of the circular continuous fit the circular continuous fit the circular continuous fit the circular circular

sily dever til to to to the terms of the ter

. The is a comment to ". The is a comment to the state of the state of

for site to the state of the st

itit san e i . ; r use i i . ; r u

I was to the state of the state

to the second of the second of

int s . little "

int s . little "

i o o i or for for the control of the control

to sayly I would have 1) is the transport to be a common and the Artist of the control The second of th of the control of the last two lines are the control of the contro Searth, name of Chica, Labor engroups of the National Street, of the Laboratory the same that are the same of and the say demanded for his, we many may so home. The man may a real formal of the term as the second person of obscious the case adversariated of the besture character. But protects properly next at results in the rate throughout from make the content of the corts. It's the abstract to companie or contents the Orland . The parties of September 12st courts and appealed at the latter from the latter of the in the yorkers from. "or Jesus por cal facts only from making all press to places have been for progress and section. The secondary, and these and address. A LONG TO THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA "Set to come again from, by the latter and the best to the come for more for any product the part and in streams was as many of countries and in the region, one for bounding and ware the addressed green of an experi-

And the second part of the second part of the second of the second part of the second par

i i io li al li al

proc. I advent. builty that I is the distribution of the street of the death and life of the death one of the street of the death and life of the street of street of the street of the street of the street of street of the street of the street of street of the street of

ur bord, i o e tully uefinitely in the describe from it is eably in 1925. I am no theologian indicated and comostant in the of systematics a theology (e.i. in the pertund elive court) but I believe in the system idea for and the interest of the court is truly and levengly as ou can be it in the lattice of any till the court in the lattice of any till the court in the

There is nothin, good or good that we still no. sou but J sub. A 15 18 no class that we will not made for ai . There is many it that we can say about boo that e will not was also about Jesus, 'the conto, is love; in whom we we our redemption, the fur iveness of our sins; we is the in or one invisious sod, t fir to rate coalions i r in the re all trings creat d, in . e a sens as upon t ert., true s visione and thing novisible, that trong or assummens or principalities to see all this are a deaths through a said unto at; , all above all things, and in aim at things contact. and is a grad nody, the march; to a limit, but it orn ar to doug the in 11 the so in there is a linear to or it was to the end in the state of the sta all the fuire a dwell; and and in to receil alt in a unto luseif, having in the bloom in comme inough ais, I as, at 'the supon the too thes id the Reaven . '

J. Dresses Britis

tras.

To si li rto.t.

1 fas.

To si li reres.

1 fas.

1 fas

creates en our main, en erc

to, appear of the state of the

o not give or t 8. 1 117 11 11 11 11 and it could be and to the little of the work, and it is the train. La lago that i coult is satisful lit. It. 18 12 Levelical, a ust irrational. i restaire at the transfer total title total data is a to 1 s u, 1 lty of rime to or or of to y y" (1 ). Lt in the office of the state o to their a production of the state of the tritian transfer to a first recommendation South the soul. is ur time. ti circles control a rain. it to a supplied to the same and the same an at altach of oil icalism II. It to 8 . . . . A Elf. o leach a l 12 1 18 16 V 2 12 1 12 1. 12 1. 15 7 18 6. 15 15 15 15 FOR THE SET OF THE TANK THE TENER OF THE SET I say is sufficient to the sure of " as truntain i and the many of the internal size. Juliante for But action to the contract of the I all the production of the second second il de la constant de la contraction de la contra r off on the Create and the land of the land of the and the state of the literature istel - is to 13 aco. L. L. t. t. l. i - 1 ... t. i f t. Land to the contract of the co

topy ur losistant to contact to the result of the result o

- lat 1 book. 1. Currection 18 bits for the constant 18 bits for the cons

I will of the little of the li · i lour back that and criticality to the contraction to is a final a faifign troid to 1 and 1 Viole Co or of the to or a line is lia : lilit fold tounantion of i fel a stour. tar : 118 - be made to the state 15 to 1 of the state of to the court of the second of the second or synvice to the right. on close it to the lost, its the result is a g B J . I ur i l h.m., i l a l'ilo lor . . or at at a training the contract of the contra 4.10 and the state but as parameter it as the safe as prove the safe is about the different safe as a safe is all evil evil and the saints. all ett wit, our our course, course, a mit-sill, All , ttr i is the contract to as to the one of the same of t TOTAL A LANG OF A ROLL OF THE STATE OF THE S The state of the s and the contract of the contra and the state of t The second secon please the second secon The state of the s or regulation for regions and a decreased, were as much to the first process from Congression and the state of t THE COLUMN THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE The Dr. a light the late of the Ville and some and over the same of the production of the last of and the state of t the contract of the contract o and the same of th the second secon named the real of the same of the same and the same and the same of the same and th ANTARIOS POLICIES OF CHICAGO PAPER. OF A SECURIOR DOUBLE OF THE PAIR NAME OF THE The same of the sa

DOMESTICAL STATES

ic and the correct in our e 11. - 1 in 1, the ever to be 1 at b., also took 100, for culture for co rollifilo lie le il lf, u r l \_\_ pur' d rusar, rt'o d do t i sor 1 in and other states are are o to the state of the alternation to the state of the sta on the state of other ten for ino in article. the rolle for u , is know that he is ll to be to see a first the first terms of the second terms of the se was 10 rent outlantion in Alta like that to a love i i end in C. L. 150 30 t 1, 12 . (1.1.) T. (51 1) July tion of the secondar as a continue to and there as no in in a mine mineral residence to or s in line s in a realistion of Jarus, the last the form to tall's fact to the late of the tall and tall and the tall and tall a in a tro, win a birthul lightly to the a common light of to the contract of the contrac Start of the start rpri 1 l s ... l l t i ... l C 1 18 st c 1 - dr. 18, july 2 to 1 to 1 to 1 to 1 i the total a title the Late

in the first of the state of th

or it low time I wo it to to the second of t

The paper of the same that the sound of the same that the

to you think the large where the there was no the contract of the contract of

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$ 

a second party and a major of the control of the co

The state of the s s con to fit our and of the life to the terms of the life to they are attract to interest and a second account to the second and the second account to the second account to · Ilianalus of or one of the form for any a loss vil . Brandlet Control is it is a fill to be in the a late of the in the parent that the continues in the parent of The Little Continues to a dude that a with and along it to be along at a fact that the t clr. The uspel is not to towned to the towner. Ur o of I was oil. 'I comel in the asper . I to the t that a plan use of the less of a lettion only be to a decoration 1., lo, lo) as Jros of callet to the get I left real air. at c are low rowely . The un By in the liter t. Gree of rist, but curea and interest in place and relationed the later later later to the later than the first terms of the later than the lat in lostes ut. You only a ver test whereit is no to be the prior to the rest of the rest trut o lle of the bull of the truth of the bull of the to the rede it . of Print, is the in the in it, by in and dy to see file to the late to the file form all the and . The control of since the since G\$\$\$4 20. \$ ... P O. ... 1480 20. . 2 , C. ... 4 I S Call To The Later of the later and the free transfer of the first transfer The Later

The of retent of the rest of t to the profile of the transfer of the terms of the potential and the state of the state to be cilibia. La color and a vertice of the city production site sour land a production of a second b lburch . It won for our work I was a second Late of the state t trunk to the control of the contro results and the last of the results al white the said the said to to the orange of the state of t 'a poéste, le comment de la commentation de la comm and the table of the terms of the table of table o tale and a large to the second and a large t Transfer to the second of the all to a care a sty med in . Sames they be not the and the second than the bear in the second m) true of the tru The state of the s المان - I S TO LEE O THE STATE OF THE I willy im to site of the site Altered to the control of the contro in the state of th The state of the s to a contract the second to th

in in in in the interest of th

-

i lod t i lar.

i lod t i lar.

i lod t i lar.

i la la lar.

i la la lar.

i la la lar.

i lar

a large of the color had a sent agent the fact of the color agent agent and a military and the second of the US S v. S ' A LINE AND A LINE S forming thanks appear to so he in the departs only of I amb from I in any The state of the s the period upon these to provide a largely on the point to provide of the Final Land Company of the second secon The Control of the Co value of the strain of the str in it is a second to the secon t territ v territ of you wo work have no all water from railways a contract the firm send a not bear. E. reference makes you have percent upon, I deliver, only the second secon a proper party of the property is not because the property of 

The last of the control of the contr

The Particular Prints.

## CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

An Inquiry Presented for the Consideration

of the Evangelical Members

of the

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By

J. Gresham Machen

Every agency appealing for funds should be willing to give an account of its stewardship to those to whom it appeals. This principle applies to the Board of Foreign Missions of our Presbyterian Church. The Board is supported not by a tax levied on the members of the Church, but by voluntary contributions. If contributors think that their gifts are being devoted by the Board to the ends for the sake of which they have contributed them, then they will continue their support; otherwise they cannot reasonably be expected to do so.

tion about continuing their support of the Board. Those are the contributors that are interested in the social or material or educational aspects of the Board's work. It is perfectly clear that our Foreign Board is performing a valuable humanitarian service in many parts of the world, and those who want to contribute to such a humanitarian service may probably have confidence in this particular agency. But there are other contributors who may well have grave doubts as to whether they are justified in continuing their gifts. These are the contributors who are interested in propagating the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God. Can these Bible-loving and Bible-believing Christians conscientiously continue their support of our Foreign Board?

About that question there is widespread doubt.

Obviously the question cannot possibly be answered by pronouncements of the General Assembly; for the distrust which evangelical Christians have with respect to the Board itself applies in equal measure to the Assembly. When, indeed, the issue between the Bible and modern unbelief is clearly presented, the Assembly usually stands on the side of the Bible; repeated pronouncements have affirmed that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of our Lord, But these proare essential doctrines of our Faith. nouncements have been made, practically speaking, a dead letter by the fact that the machinery of the Church is almost altogether in the hands of those who are concealing the real gravity of the situation that exists. Evasive reports as to the state of the Church, like that of the Commission of Fifteen of 1925-1927, will hardly restore the confidence of evangelical Christians; on the contrary, they will in the end do more to destroy confidence than any open presentation of the facts could possibly do. If, therefore, the Foreign Board is to regain the lost confidence of evangelical Christians

<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly stood on the side of the Bible in the "Gantz case" in 1925. In 1927, in the judicial case concerning the licensure of candidates in the Presbytery of New York, it stood against the Bible and in favor of modern unbelief, but only because of the fact that the Moderator, Dr. Speer, quite illegally permitted the representatives of the Synod of New York, who were parties in interest, to vote in the case.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1910 confirmed by that of 1923 (Minutes, 1923, p. 253).

in the Church, it cannot do so by any appeal to ecclesiastical committees, but can only do so by meeting squarely the objections of individual givers. These individual givers must still raise the question: "Can evangelical Christians conscientiously contribute to our Foreign Board?"

I shall not now attempt to answer that question in any comprehensive way; I shall not attempt any comprehensive examination of the work which the Board is carrying on in foreign lands; but shall merely refer to certain disquieting facts which have come under my immediate observation. Those disquieting facts concern, first, the treatment of candidates for the mission field and, second, the pronouncements of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

I.

with regard to the former subject, my position as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary has given me rather unusual opportunities for observation. I have been thrown into close spiritual contact with a large body of young men who graduate from our Seminary from year to year. These young men, of course, differ widely as to the clearness with which they have received into their minds and hearts the gospel of the Cross of Christ; and, in particular, they differ widely in the degree of bravery with which they are resolved to proclaim that gospel in the presence of the unbelief now rampant in the Church. But the large majority of them - indeed a proportion truly amazing in view of the hostile

#4.
forces now abroad in the world - have resolved to stand firmly
for that gospel of the Cross, and firmly against the current
indifferentism and unbelief.

Some of these men have cherished as the ambition of their lives the thought of going to the foreign mission field. At last the time approaches for the realization of their high resolve. They meet in conference with representatives of our Board of Foreign Missions. What impression is made by these conferences upon their minds? Are these young men commended for the clearness with which they recognize the insufficiency of all other ways of salvation save the Cross of Christ considered as a substitutionary death for our sins; are they warned against the deadly peril of making common cause with those who preach the "other gospel" of agnostic Modernism: are they encouraged to trust, not in ecclesiastical combinations of human influences, but simply and solely in the Spirit of God making use of the blessed gospel that the Scriptures contain; are they commended for their understanding of the distinctiveness of our Reformed Faith over against various subtractions from the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God; are they confirmed in their sense of the high liberty of the Presbyterian minister whether at home or abroad? I can certainly, to say the least, find no clear evidence that such is the case. On the contrary, these young men, so far as I can judge by the spiritual effect on them, are given the impression that they are expected to conform to

the policy of church ocoperation and union which the representatives of the Board favor, and that not separation from the non-Christian world, whether within or without the visible Church, but cooperation with those who differ from us is the crying need of the hour.

My impression with regard to this matter is strengthened by the official "Candidate Reference Blank" which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries. That reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others", "desire to progress in spiritual truth", "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions on this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ as it is set forth in Holy Scripture, and whether he himself is clear in

his understanding of the great issue between supernaturalism and naturalism, between evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the Church. There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Such a questionnaire, because of the choice of leading questions, creates very plainly the impression that "tolerance of opposing views" is far more valued by the Foreign Board than loyalty to the whole word of God.

The same impression is also created by the "Application Form" which the candidates themselves are asked to fill out. That form contains the following question (Section I, question 17):

Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions?

It is difficult to see how any Christian man, certainly how any Protestant, can possibly answer such a question in the affirmative. The Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley, indeed, the Candidate Secretary of the Board, in his letter to me of March 8, 1928, distinguishes between "opinions" and "convictions":

This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout.

But in making this distinction between opinions and convictions,

Mr. Hadley seems to differ sharply from the form of government of our Church, where, in Chapter I, Section iv, it is said:

> And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are (italics mine).

Here the word "opinion" seems clearly to be used in the sense in which Mr. Hadley uses the word "conviction". And surely, in this difference, the Form of Gevernment and not Mr. Hadley is right. The man who does not share a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as an "opinion"; the man who does share it is inclined to regard it as a "conviction". "Opinion" and "conviction", therefore, from the point of view with which we are now concerned, are practically speaking synonymous terms. I still do not see, therefore, how any evangelical Christian, in this day of widespread defection from the faith, can possibly answer in the affirmative the question in the Application Form.

This impression is deepened by an examination of Section IV in the Application Form, which deals with "Religious Experience". That section is declared by the Candidate Secretary in the letter to which reference has already been made, to be "very definite". The secretary writes as follows:

This Question (Question 17 of Section I), as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 3 under "Religious Experience", which, as you will see are very definite. (italics mine).

Let us now turn to those statements which Mr. Hadley declared to be "very definite". The only questions in the sections which can by any chance be referred to are questions 3,5,6. The last two of these read as follows:

- 5. Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord, and Master?
- 6. Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your missionary career, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?

Are these the questions which Mr. Hadley regards as "very definite"? Surely the adjective as applied to them is strangely misplaced; for the questions are utterly vague. All the terms used - "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" - are used today in such widely diverse senses that the questions could be answered in the affirmative by men who from the point of view of the Bible and of evangelical Christians are unbelievers of a very thoroughgoing kind. That the Candidate Secretary of our Board of Foreign Missions should speak of such studiedly vague language as being "very definite" raises in very insistent fashion the question whether evangelical Christians can possibly continue

to contribute to such a Board.

This question becomes still more insistent when we examine the remaining one of the three questions to which reference has just been made. That question is Question 5. It reads as follows:

3. Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?

This question must surely be taken in connection with Question 17 of Section I which has been quoted above. The candidate must have no views that prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, and he must be willing to submit his opinion to the majority vote of any group of such missionaries to which he may belong. It is surely a large promise; and we ought to consider carefully what it may involve. What may those "opinions" be which the candidate must, on occasion, be allowed to over-ride his own?

The impression has certainly been made upon some candidates that among the opinions which he is required to allow to over-ride his own are opinions like those which led to the formation of the United Church of Canada; the impression has olearly been made that former service in the Presbyterian Church of Canada (called by its enemies the "Continuing" Presbyterian Church) is to be regarded as a ground of suspicion when a candidate comes before the representatives of our Board.

Mr. Hadley says that that is not the case; yet in view of his correspondence with me I cannot see how any other impression could possibly have been produced. The whole impression is that the candidate must be ready on occasion to give up the Faith of our Church in accordance with a majority vote, as though he were merely changing a suit of clothes.

At any rate there is one set of "opinions" with which a missionary in these days can hardly avoid contact. It is the kind of opinion represented by the "Auburn Affirmation", which declares in perfectly plain language that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracle of our Lord are non-essential even for the ministers in our Church. The Affirmation has been signed by about thirteen hundred of our ministers, and unquestionably the point of view that it represents is shared by very large numbers of ministers who did not sign it. What guarantee has the candidate that such opinions are not represented on our mission field, and that it is not to such opinions that he is being asked by question 17 to be willing to submit his own?

But it is not merely such general disquietude that suggests itself in this connection. For it is a fact - a fact which will come as a surprise and shock to many evangelical Christians throughout the Church, but still a fact all the same - that Mr. Hadley, the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Board,

is himself a signer of the Affirmation. This secretary
who fills this peculiarly important position, who stands in
this peculiarly intimate relation to the men who desire to devote themselves to foreign mission work, is a signer of a
formal statement that is hostile not only to evangelical Christianity but to all Christianity at its very root.

The cancer of the Auburn Affirmation and what it represents, moreover, cuts far deeper into our Foreign Board than merely by the presence of an Affirmationist in the position of Candidate Secretary. No less than four among the fifteen ministerial members of the Board are signers of this notable anti-evangelical pronouncement. And what, in this situation, is the attitude of the staff, as distinguished from the governing members, of the Board? Dr. Robert E. Speer, surely, is qualified to give the answer. His answer is given in a letter which he sent to me, jointly with Dr. John A. Marquis of the Board of National Missions, on May 6, 1926:

First - all the members of the Boards of the Church were elected by the General Assembly. The Assembly clearly believed that they were loyal and faithful ministers and members of the Church. We know of not one who does not accept the Constitution and Standards of the Church and who is not truly and loyally evangelical.

At the time when that letter was written, no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the Foreign Board were

are regarded as "truly and loyally evangelical" by Dr. Marquis and Dr. Speer: What possible confidence can really consistent evangelical Christians have in Boards whose Standards of what is truly and loyally evangelical are such as that? What kind of mission work is it in which the full truthfulness of Holy Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are, all and severally, regarded as non-essential? Certainly it is a kind of mission work which no consistent evangelical Christian can support.

Is it such questions with regard to which candidates for the mission field are required to show "tolerance of the point of view of others"? The whole tendency, the whole attitude of the Candidate Department strongly creates such an impression. The question is not whether men who are lukewarm in their testimony against Medernism will be sent to the foreign field, but whether men who are faithful in their testimony, will be sent. One thing at least is clear: No real evangelical Christian, certainly no intelligent one, can possibly, without disloyalty to his Saviour and Lord, contribute to any mission work that is favorable to the point of view represented by the Auburn Affirmation. The Affirmation is hostile to repeated pronouncements of the General

Assembly. But that is not the serious objection to it. The really serious objection to it is that it is hostile to the Word of God.

II.

A second cause of disquiet regarding the Foreign Board is found in the utterances of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

Among those utterances, one deserves special attention. It is the booklet, "Are Foreigh Missions Done For?", which Dr. Speer has recently distributed widely in the Church. "This little book", says the preface, "is an attempt to meet fairly and honestly some of the present day questions which are raised with regard to the foreign missionary enterprise." The booklet has been widely distributed, and evidently it is intended by its author to be an apologia for the work of our Foreign Board. Here then, if anywhere, the evangelical Christian might fairly expect to obtain some sort of answer to the questions which he has felt obliged to raise.

Are such expectations satisfied? We are obliged to say very plainly that they are not. Far from setting forth any clearly evangelical position on the great specific questions that agitate the Church, Dr. Speer's book from beginning to end is dishearteningly evasive and vague.

This vagueness appears in most distressing form just when the author seems to suppose that what he says is

particularly clear. No less than twice in the course of the book Dr. Speer quotes an utterance made by a conference held at Princeton in 1920. That utterance, he says. has "nothing uncertain or confused" about it; "it is definite and comprehensive"(p.56). The evangelical reader will naturally turn with high hopes to an utterance for which such claims are advanced. Surely, he will say, the utterance must set forth in no uncertain terms the authority of the written Word as over against the current mysticism that turns rather to Christian experience or Christ in the soul; surely it must declare the absolute necessity, for every missionary, of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

Are such hopes realized? What is this evangelical utterance which Dr. Speer declares to be so comprehensive and so plain? The evangelical Christian may have difficulty in believing his eyes when he finds that the following is all that it is:

The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these

<sup>(1)</sup> Pp. 56,81. In one other place, also, a practically identical declaration is quoted (p. 64).

disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and selfgoverning; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

Such is the utterance which is declared to be so definite and so clear! No doubt it will seem clear to the agnostic Modernism that is rampant in our Church; for it is couched in just the vague, ambiguous language that modernism loves. All the terms, "Lord", "Divine Saviour", "disciples", and, alas, "Jesus Christ" - are used today in senses entirely alien to the Word of God; and the utterance ignores altogether the grand particularities of the Christian faith. The utterance speaks of "the spirit and principles of Christ": but "spirit" is spelled with a small letter and the Third Person of the blessed Trinity is ignored; the utterance speaks of Jesus as Saviour, but there is nothing about the sin from which He saves or the Cross by which salvation was wrought: the utterance speaks of bringing to bear upon human life "the spirit and principles of Christ", but there is nothing about the necessity of the mysterious, regenerating work of God's Spirit, without which "the spirit and principles of Christ" (whatever they may be) are quite powerless to save men from wrath to come. In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the

word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is
found in redemption by the precious blood of Christ. Yet
Dr. Speer says (p.81): "No better answer can be given to those
who wish to know what our foreign missionaries conceive that they
are about and how they are setting about it than to quote the
(1)
more important of the Findings of this Conference". We
can only say that if this be the answer which our Foreign
Board has to give regarding the content of the Christian message, then it is difficult to see how evangelical Christians
can continue their support of the Board. So far as this
declaration indicates, the Board may be propagating the vague
"other gospel" of non-doctrinal Modernism just as probably
as the blessed gospel that the Bible contains.

The vagueness that characterizes this utterance also characterizes the whole booklet of Dr. Speer. There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bedily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all), no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death

(2)

of Christ? What sort of gospel is it from which all

<sup>(1)</sup> Then follows (pp.81-85) the paragraph quoted above and a fuller transcript of the findings of the Conference, which, however, does not really go beyond this paragraph so far as questions of principle are concerned.

<sup>(2)</sup> There is one bare mention of "the Crucified and ever Living Lord" (p.37).

that makes a gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away, but so is the glory and the power.

In one thing, indeed, we agree heartily with Dr.

Speer. We agree with him heartily in holding that foreign missions are not "done for"; we agree with him heartily in holding that the "missionary enterprise" is the greatest enterprise in all the world.

Some of the testimonies to which he appeals seem to us, indeed, very unconvincing. These are the testimonies of non-Christian men in mission countries - testimonies to the "moral and spiritual values" of Christianity, to the loftiness of Jesus' teaching and example, to the transforming power of His "principles". Sadness comes over us as we read Dr. Speer's rehearsal of such testimonies. Would they ever have been rendered if missionaries had been faithful in preaching the real Christ? The plain fact is that the real Christ advanced stupendous claims. Unless those claims are true, He is not a perfect ideal at all. He uttered a "hard saying"; and many of his former followers went back and walked no more with Him. Has that hard saying been kept in the background today, that Jesus might win this superficial and patronizing favor among those who have not been born again? Could that favor ever have been won if missionaries had put

#18.

Calvary in its proper place, if they had been willing to bear the offence of the Cross? Such questions do arise in our minds when we read Dr. Speer's enthusiastic words about the permeation of the nations with Christian principles and the Christian "spirit".

Christian living by those who are without. How often in recent years has such testimony been wrung from unwilling lips by those who amid the fires of persecution have been true to Jesus Christ: Still, the message of the Cross, when it is faithfully presented, is a very offensive thing. It is to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. When the offence of it is avoided, we are inclined to doubt the faithfulness of the preaching. God grant that the Church, both at home and abroad, may never be ashamed of the offence of the Cross:

But if we differ from Dr. Speer in the arguments by which we defend foreign missions, we agree with him with all our soul in the conclusion. We agree with him in holding that foreign missions are the only hope of the world. Indeed, far more poignant is our sense of the need of foreign missions than is his. For we do not share his favorable view of (1) human nature; the primary fact, we hold, is that mankind

<sup>(1) &</sup>quot;What is needed" Dr. Speer says (p.41), "is that everywhere in all lands man should be set free from what is evil and bad and that human good should be built by God's help through Christ and His Gospel." What a difference there is between this teaching and Jesus' words to Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again"! Compare the beginning of Dr. Speer's book, "The unfinished Task of Foreign Missions (1926), where, on pp. 10f., the use of human goodness - illustrated by Jerome K. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back"-is represented as being the method of Jesus!

everywhere is lost in sin. We cannot keep that fact in the background as Dr. Speer does. It and it alone constitutes the really
profound need of the world. How great then is the obligation to
preach the one message that will save lost sinners and bring them
into peace with God:

But where is that message to be found? Where are missionaries to find the message that they shall proclaim throughout the That is surely a basic question. Yet no clear answer to world? it can be found in Dr. Speer's book - - certainly not the true answer. Dr. Speer speaks of "the search for the infinite riches of God in Christ" (p.37), "a quest for an ever enlarging understanding of the fulness of Christ" (ibid.); but nowhere does he speak of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the true source of the missionary message. He hopes for "some exposure of treasures in Christ or in the New Testament or in the Holy Spirit which have been hidden as yet". (p.46). We cannot help feeling that the Bible is here removed from the unique place in which it is put - and rightly put - in the Standards of our Church. New exposures of truth, Dr. Speer says, are to be expected from Christ or from the New Testament or from the Holy Spirit. boundless confusion is here, what woeful lack of clearness as to the very foundation of all missionary work!

<sup>(1)</sup> Compare Dr. Speer's book "The New Opportunity of the Church", 1919, p.44: "Deeper and more religious meanings than we have everproclaimed are discerned in the Cross of Christ, revealed, and illustrated in the war." Does Dr. Speer mean that these new "meanings" are deeper and more religious than those that are set forth in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians or in the eighth chapter of Romans? And have these Scriptural "meanings" never been proclaimed from New Testament times until the World War? Ah, how far are we here from the majestic simplicity of the gospel of the Cross:

What is the missionary to say when he begins work on his field? Is he to appeal to a Christ in his own soul, is he to draw from his own experience for the content of his message, is he to place the treasures which he finds in the New Testament alongside of other treasures which he finds in Christ or in the Holy Spirit? If he does so, he has deserted the basis upon which all the teaching of our Church rests - - namely, the authority of the blessed written word of God.

Very different should be the attitude of the true missionary of the Cross. His function is a humbler function, and yet a function which in its humility may prove to be the most glorious function of all. His function is not to draw upon mystical experiences of his own for the content of his message, but simply to set forth what is taught in God's Word — both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, both in the words of Jesus in the Gospels and in the words of the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of Paul. The function of the true missionary is simply to open the pages of the Holy Book and say: "Thus saith the Lord."

He cannot, indeed, do that with any power unless he has received the message in his own heart, unless he knows in his own soul the living Saviour whom the Scriptures present. The Holy Spirit must illumine for him the sacred page. But the content of his message will be based upon the Bible and upon the Bible alone.

When the message is based upon the Bible alone, the content of the message will be very different from that which now is

Gone will be all vagueness like the vagueness of Dr. Speer's little book. Instead, there will stand out the great verities which the Church is commissioned to set forth -- the awful holiness of God, the deadly guilt and power of sin, the true deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His virgin birth. His mighty miracles, His obedience to the law, His righteousness with which believers are clothed, His sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. His glorious resurrection in the body in which he suffered, His ascension into Heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the utter powerlessness of man, the sovereign grace of God by which alone are made alive those who were dead in trespasses and sins, the new and right relation to God received only by those in whom the Holy Spirit has wrought faith, the new walk and conversation of those who have been received by God and made alive from the dead, the dread yet glorious hope of Christ's supernatural appearing in glory when He shall come to judge the world.

A new and glorious day will it be for a distracted Church when that message again shall ring out clear, when there shall be a return from the imaginations of men's hearts to God's holy Word.

Meanwhile there are those who already love and honor that Word.

What shall they do in the present day? Can they continue to support a mission agency that has wandered so far? There are many men and women in our Church who are raising that question. And they will raise it yet more earnestly if they read Dr. Speer's little book with care.

What, then, should evangelical Christians now do? Can they conscientiously continue their contributions to such a Board?

The question might seem to have been answered by what has already been said. But the answer is not really quite so simple as it seems. We ought never to forget that despite the attitude of the Board there are many faithful missionaries under the Board who are proclaiming the full gospel as it is set forth in the whole Word of God. Those faithful missionaries of the Cross should not be allowed to suffer because of the faults of the administrative agency under which they stand. Until some truly evangelical agency is formed to care for those faithful missionaries, evangelical people cannot withhold their support of the present Board.

But has the time not come for the establishment of a truly evangelical missionary agency in the Presbyterian Church — an agency to which evangelical Christians can contribute, not with hesitation and distrust, but with all confidence and jcy, an agency which shall keep clear of entangling alliances and shall proclaim the full glories of the Reformed Faith as they are found in the word of God? The question may well be raised; it may well be commended to the prayerful consideration of that large body of Christian laymen in our Church who love their Bibles and the crucified Savieur set forth therein, who know that the "principles of Jesus" will never save the world — nor what Dr. Speer calls His [1] "redeeming life" — but only His precious redeeming blood,

<sup>(1)</sup> The relation of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise to the World Situation Today," in Christian Students and World Problems, 1924, p. 139.

who are not seeking the patronizing testimony of non-Christian men, which Dr. Speer rehearses at such length, but who are willing to bear the offence of the Cross.

If such an evangelical agency is formed, its virtues must be not merely negative but positive; it must not only avoid denying the gospel, but it must preach the gospel in all its fullness and in all its power. One fundamental vice underlies the defence of the present Board; its representatives seem to think that the burden of proof is to be placed upon those who deny that the Board is sounding an evangelical note. "Be definite in your charges", they say in effect; "point out individual missionaries against whom charges of heresy can be preferred, or else keep silent with your criticism and continue your support." What is the trouble with such a line of defence? Is it not that the defence is negative merely? The assumption seems to be that if the missionaries or the secretaries of the Board cannot be proved to be saying that which is contrary to the gospel of Christ, then all is well. But cannot these gentlemen really understand any better than that the point of view of evangelical Christians in Cannot they understand that what evangelical Christour Church? ians demand is not an agency that avoids denying the gospel of the Cross of Christ, that perhaps pays perfunctory lip service to it on explicit demand, but an agency that is on fire with that gospel. that never for one moment keeps it in the background, that preaches it in season and out of season, that combats what is contradictory to it, that presents it as the only way of salvation for lost and

dying men? If in answer to the present paper Dr. Speer should affirm his belief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have been able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away - - if he should affirm his belief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn Affirmationists have done despite, if even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs, still our objections would not really be removed. What we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -- not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not, we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with Wis own precious blood. Woe be to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gospel than the gospel of the Cross. And may God show us how we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world!

## CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

An Inquiry Presented for the Consideration of the Evangelical Members

of the

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Ву

J. Gresham Machen

Every agency appealing for funds should be willing to give an account of its stewardship to those to whom it appeals. This principle applies to the Board of Foreign Missions of our Presbyterian Church. The Board is supported not by a tax levied on the members of the Church, but by voluntary contributions. If contributors think that their gifts are being devoted by the Board to the ends for the sake of which they have contributed them, then they will continue their support; otherwise they cannot reasonably be expected to do so.

There are some contributors who need have no hesitation about continuing their support of the Board. Those are the contributors that are interested in the social or material or educational aspects of the Board's work. It is perfectly clear that our Foreign Board is performing a valuable humanitarian service in many parts of the world, and those who want to contribute to such a humanitarian service may probably have confidence in this particular agency. But there are other contributors who may well have grave doubts as to whether they are justified in continuing their gifts. These are the contributors who are interested in propagating the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God. Can these Bible-loving and Bible-believing Christians conscientiously continue their support of our Foreign Board?

Obviously the question cannot possibly be answered by pronouncements of the General Assembly; for the distrust which evangelical Christians have with respect to the Board itself applies in equal measure to the Assembly. When, indeed, the issue between the Bible and modern belief is clearly presented, the Assembly usually stands on the side of the Bible; (1) repeated pronouncements have affirmed that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of our Lord, are essential doctrines of our Faith (2). But these pronouncements have been made, practically speaking, a dead letter by the fact that the machinery of the Church is almost altogether in the hands of those who are concealing the real gravity of the situation that exists. Evasive reports as to the state of the Church, like that of the Commission of Fifteen of 1925-1927, will hardly restore the confidence of evangelical Christians; on the contrary, they will in the end do more to destroy confidence than any open presentation of the facts could possibly do. If, therefore, the Foreign Board is to regain the lost confidence of evangelical Christians in the Church, it cannot do so by any appeal to ecclesiastical

<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly stood on the side of the Bible in the "Gantz case" in 1925. In 1927, in the judicial case concerning the licensure of candidates in the Presbytery of New York, it stood against the Bible and in favor of modern unbelief, but only because of the fact that the Moderator, Dr. Speer, quite illegally permitted the representatives of the Synod of New York, who were parties in interest, to vote in the case.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1910 confirmed by that of 1923 (Minutes, 1923, p. 253).

committees, but can only do so by meeting squarely the objections of individual givers. These individual givers must still raise the question: "Can evangelical Christians conscientiously contribute to our Foreign Board?"

I shall not now attempt to answer that question in any comprehensive way; I shall not attempt any comprehensive examination of the work which the Board is carrying on in foreign lands; but shall merely refer to certain disquieting facts which have come under my immediate observation. Those disquieting facts concern, first, the treatment of candidates for the mission field and, second, the pronouncements of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

I.

With regard to the former subject, my position as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary has given me rather unusual opportunities for observation. I have been thrown into close spiritual contact with a large body of young men who graduate from our seminary from year to year. These young men, of course, differ widely as to the clearness with which they have received into their minds and hearts the gospel of the Cross of Christ; and, in particular, they differ widely in the degree of bravery with which they are resolved to proclaim that gospel in the presence of the unbelief now rampant in the Church. But the large majority of them - indeed a proportion truly amazing in view of the hostile forces now abroad in the world - have resolved to stand firmly for that gospel of the Cross, and firmly against the current indifferentism and unbelief.

Some of these men have cherished as the ambition of their lives the thought of going to the foreign mission field. At last the time approaches for the realization of their high resolve. They meet in conference with representatives of our Board of Foreign Missions. What impression is made by these conferences upon their minds? Are these young men commended for the clearness with which they recognize the insufficiency of all other ways of salvation save the Cross of Christ considered as a substitutionary death for our sins; are they warned against the deadly peril of making common cause with those who preach the "other gospel" of agnostic Modernism; are they encouraged to trust, not in ecclesiastical combinations of human influences, but simply and solely in the Spirit of God making use of the blessed gospel that the Scriptures contain; are they commended for their understanding of the distinctiveness of our Reformed Faith over against various subtractions from the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God; are they confirmed in their sense of the high liberty of the Presbyterian minister whether at home or abroad? I can certainly, to say the least, find no clear evidence that such is the case. On the contrary, these young men, so far as I can judge by the spiritual effect on them, are given the impression that they are expected to conform to the policy of church Cooperation and union which the representatives of the Board favor, and that not separation from the non-Christian world, whether within or without the visible Church, but cooperation with those who differ from us is the crying need of the hour.

My impression with regard to this matter is strengthened by the

official "Candidate Reference Blank" which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries. The reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others", "desire to progress in spiritual truth," "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions on this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ as it is set forth in Holy Scripture, and whether he himself is clear in his understanding of the great issue between supernaturalism and naturalism, between evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the Churche There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Such a questionnaire, because of the choice of leading questions, creates very plainly the impression that "tolerance of opposing views" is far more valued by the Foreign Board than loyalty to the whole Word of God.

The same impression is also created by the "Application Form" which the candidates themselves are asked to fill out. That form contains the following question "Section I, Question 17):

Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions?

It is difficult to see how any Christian man, certainly how any Protestant, can possibly answer such a question in the affirmative. The Rev. Lindsay S.B. Hadley, indeed, the Candidate Secretary of the Board, in his letter to me of March 8, 1928, distinguishes between "opinions" and "convictions":

This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which raturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout.

But in making this distinction between opinions and convictions, Mr. Hadley seems to differ sharply from the Form of Government of our Church, where in Chapter I, Section iv, it is said:

And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are (italics mine). Here the word "opinion" seems clearly to be used in the sense in which Mr. Hadley uses the word "conviction". And surely, in this difference, the Form of Government and not Mr. Hadley is right. The man who does not share a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as an "opinion"; the man who does share it is inclined to regard it as a "conviction". "Opinion" and "conviction", therefore, from the point of view with which we are now concerned, are practically speaking synonymous terms. I still do not see, therefore, how any evangelical Christian, in this day of widespread defection from the faith, can possibly answer in the affirmative the question in the Application Form.

This impression is deepened by an examination of Section IV in the Application Form, which deals with "Religious Experience". That section is declared by the Candidate Secretary in the letter to which reference has already been made, to be "very definite". The secretary writes as follows:

This question (Question 17 of Section I) as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 3 under "Religious Experience", which, as you will see zre very definite (italics mine).

Let us now turn to those statements which Mr. Hadley declared to be "very definite". The only questions in the section which can by any chance be referred to are Questions 3,5,6. The last two of these read as follows:

- 5. Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord, and Master?
- 6. Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your missionary career, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?

Are these the questions which Mr. Hadley regards as "very definite"?

Surely the adjective as applied to them is strangely misplaced; for the questions are utterly vague. All the terms used - "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" - are used today in such widely diverse senses that the questions could be answered in the affirmative by men who from the point of view of the Bible and of evangelical Christians are unbelievers of a very thoroughgoing kind. That the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Missions should speak of such studiedly vague language as being "very definite" raises in very insistent fashion the question whether evangelical Christians can possibly continue to contribute to such a Board.

This question becomes still more insistent when we examine the remaining one of the three questions to which reference has just been made.

That question is Question 3. It reads as follows:

3. Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?

This question must surely be taken in connection with Question 17 of Section I which has been quoted above. The candidate must have no views that prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, and he must be willing to submit his opinion to the majority vote of any group of such missionaries to which he may belong. It is surely a large promise; and we ought to consider carefully what it may involve. What may those "opinions" be which the candidate must, on occasion, be allowed to override his own?

The impression has certainly been made upon some candidates that among the opinions which he is required to allow to over-ride his own are opinions like those which led to the formation of the United Church of Canada; the impression has clearly been made that former service in the Presbyterian Church of Canada (called by its enemies the "Continuing Presbyterian Church) is to be regarded as a ground of suspicion when a candidate comes before the representatives of our Board. Mr. Hadley says that that is not the case; yet in view of his correspondence with me I cannot see how any other impression could possibly have been produced. The whole impression is that the candidate must be ready on occasion to give up the Faith of our Church in accordance with a majority vote, as though he were merely changing a suit of clothes.

At any rate there is one set of "opinions" with which a missionary in these days can hardly avoid contact. It is the kind of opinion represented by the "Auburn Affirmation", which declares in perfectly plain language that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are non-essential even for the ministers in our Church. The Affirmation has been signed by about thirteen hundred of our ministers, and unquestionably the point of view that it represents is shared by very large numbers of ministers who did not sign it. What guarantee has the candidate that such opinions are not represented on our mission field, and that it is not to such opinions that he is being asked by Question 17 to be willing to submit his own?

But it is not merely such general disquietude that suggests itself in this connection. For it is a fact - a fact which will come as a surprise and shock to many evangelical Christians throughout the Church, but still a fact all the same - that Mr. Hadley, the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Board, is himself a signer of the Affirmation. This Secretary, who fills this peculiarly important position, who stands in this peculiarly intimate relation to the men who desire to devote themselves to foreign mission work, is a signer of a formal statement that is hostile not only to evangelical Christianity but to all Christianity at its very root.

The cancer of the Auburn Affirmation and what it represents, moreover, cuts far deeper into our Foreign Board than merely by the presence of an

Affirmationist in the position of Candidate Secretary. No less than four among the fifteen ministerial members of the Board are signers of this notable anti-evangelical pronouncement. And what, in this situation, is the attitude of the staff, as distinguished from the governing members, of the Board? Dr. Robert E. Speer, surely, is qualified to give the answer. His answer is given in a letter which he sent to me, jointly with Dr. John A. Marquis of the Board of National Missions, on May 6, 1926:

First - all the members of the Board of the Church were elected by the General Assembly. The Assembly clearly believed that they were loyal and faithful ministers and members of the Church. We know of not one who does not accept the Constitution and Standards of the Church and who is not truly and loyally evangelical.

At the time when that letter was written, no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the Foreign Board were signers of the Auburn Affirmation. Yet all these gentlemen are regarded as "truly and loyally evangelical" by Dr. Marquis and Dr. Speer: What possible confidence can really consistent evangelical Christians have in Boards whose standards of what is truly and loyally evangelical are such as this? What kind of mission work is it in which the full truthfulness of Holy Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are, all and severally, regarded as non-essential? Certainly it is a kind of mission work which no consistent evangelical Christian can support.

Is it such questions with regard to which candidates for the mission field are required to show "tolerance of the point of view of others"? The whole tendency, the whole attitude of the Candidate Department strongly creates such an impression. The question is not whether men are lukewarm in their testimony against Modernism will be sent to the foreign field, but whether men who are faithful in their testimony, will be sent. One thing at least is clear: No real evangelical Christian, certainly no intelligent one, can possibly, without disloyalty to his Saviour and Lord, contribute to any mission work that is favorable to the point of view represented by the Auburn Affirmation. The Affirmation is hostile to repeated pronouncements of the General Assembly. But that is not the serious objection to it. The really serious objection to it is that it is hostile to the Word of God.

II.

A second cause of disquiet regarding the Foreign Board is found in the utterances of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

Among those utterances, one deserves special attention. It is the booklet, "Are Foreign Missions Done For?" which Dr. Speer has recently dis-

tributed widely in the Church. "This little book", says the preface, "is an attempt to meet fairly and honestly some of the present day questions which are raised with regard to the foreign missionary enterprise." The booklet has been widely distributed, and evidently it is intended by its author to be an apologia for the work of our Foreign Board. Here then, if anywhere, the evangelical Christian might fairly expect to obtain some sort of answer to the questions which he has felt obliged to raise.

Are such expectations satisfied? We are obliged to say very plainly that they are not. Far from setting forth any clearly evangelical position on the great specific questions that agitate the Church, Dr. Speer's book from beginning to end is dishearteningly evasive and vague.

This vagueness appears in most distressing form just when the author seems to suppose that what he says is particularly clear. No less than twice in the course of the book Dr. Speer quotes an utterance made by a conference held at Princeton in 1920 (1). That utterance, he says has "nothing uncertain or confused" about it; "it is definite and comprehensive" (p.56). The evangelical reader will naturally turn with high hopes to an utterance for which such claims are advanced. Surely, he will say, the utterance must set forth in no uncertain terms the authority of the written Word as over against the current mysticism that turns rather to Christian experience or Christ in the soul; surely it must declare the absolute necessity, for every missionary, of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

Are such hopes realized? What is this evangelical utterance which Dr. Speer declares to be so comprehensive and so plain? The evangelical Christian may have difficulty in believing his eyes when he finds that the following is all that it is:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

<sup>(1)</sup> Pp. 56, 81. In one other place, also, a practically identical declaration is quoted. (p. 64).

Such is the utterance which is declared to be so definite and so clear! No doubt it will seem clear to the agnostic Modernism that is rampant in our Church: for it is couched in just the vague, ambiguous language that Modernism loves. All the terms - "Lord", "Divine Saviour", "disciples", and, alas, "Jesus Christ" are used today in senses entirely alien to the Word of God; and the utterance ignores altogether the grand particularities of the Christian faith. The utterance speaks of "the spirit and principles of Christ"; but "spirit" is spelled with a small letter and the Third Person of the blessed Trinity is ignored: the utterance speaks of Jesus as Saviour, but there is nothing about the sin from which He saves or the Cross by which salvation was wrought; the utterance speaks of bringing to bear upon human life "the spirit and principles of Christ", but there is nothing about the necessity of the mysterious, regenerating work of God's Spirit, without which "the spirit and principles of Christ" (whatever they may be) are quite powerless to save men from wrath to come. In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the precious blood of Christ. Yet Dr. Speer says (p.81): "No better answer can be given to those who wish to know what our foreign missionaries conceive that they are about and how they are setting about it than to quote the more important of the Findings of this Conference". (1) We can only say that if this be the answer which our Foreign Board has to give regarding the content of the Christian message, then it is difficult to see how evangelical Christians can continue their support of the Board. So far as this declaration indicates, the Board may be propagating the vague "other gospel" of non-doctrinal Modernism just as probably as the blessed gospel that the Bible contains.

The vagueness that characterizes this utterance also characterizes the whole booklet of Dr. Speer. There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all), no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ? What sort of gospel is it from which all that makes a gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away, but so is the glory and the power.

Some of the testimonies to which he appeals seem to us, indeed, very unconvincing. There are the testimonies of non-Christian men in mission countries - testimonies to the "moral and spiritual values" of Christianity, to the loftiness of Jesus' teaching and example, to the transforming power of His "principles." Sadness comes over us as we read Dr. Speer's rehearsal of such testimonies. Would they ever have been rendered if missionaries had been faithful in preaching the real Christ? The plain fact is that the real Christ advanced stupendous claims. Unless those claims are true, He is not a perfect

<sup>(1)</sup> Then follows (pp.81-85) the paragraph quoted above and a fuller transcript of the findings of the Conference, which, however, does not really go beyond this paragraph so far as questions of principles are concerned.

(2) There is one bare mention of "the Crucified and ever Living Lord". (p.37).

ideal at all. He uttered a "hard saying"; and many of His former followers went back and walked no more with Him. Has that hard saying been kept in the background today, that Jesus might win this superficial and patronizing favor among those who have not been been again? Could that favor ever have been won if missionaries had put Calvary in its proper place, if they had been willing to bear the offense of the Cross? Such questions do arise in our minds when we read Dr. Speer's enthusiastic words about the permeation of the nations with Christian principles and the Christian "spirit".

We do not, indeed, undervalue a good testimony to Christian living by those who are without. How often in recent years has such testimony been wrung from unwilling lips by those who amid the fires of persecution have been true to Jesus Christ: Still, the message of the Cross, when it is faithfully presented, is a very offensive thing. It is to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. When the offense of it is avoided, we are inclined to doubt the faithfulness of the preaching. God grant that the Church, both at home and abroad, may never be ashamed of the offense of the Cross:

But if we differ from Dr. Speer in the arguments by which we defend foreign missions, we agree with him with all our souls in the conclusion. We agree with him in holding that foreign missions are the only hope of the world. Indeed far more poignant is our sense of the need of foreign missions than is his. For we do not share his favorable view of human nature (1); the primary fact, we hold, is that mankind everywhere is lost in sin. We cannot keep that fact in the background as Dr. Speer does. It and it alone constitutes the really profound need of the world. How great then is the obligation to preach the one message that will save lost sinners and bring them into peace with God:

But where is that message to be found? Where are missionaries to find the message that they shall proclaim throughout the world? That is surely a basic question. Yet no clear answer to it can be found in Dr. Speer's book -- certainly not the true answer. Dr. Speer speaks of "the search for the infinite riches of God in Christ" (p.37), "a quest for an ever enlarging understanding of the fulness of Christ" (ibid.); but nowhere does he speak of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the true source of the missionary message. He hopes for "some exposure of treasures in Christ or in the New Testament or in the Holy Spirit which have been hidden as yet". (p.46) We cannot help feeling that the Bible is here removed from the unique place in which it is put -- and rightly put -- in the standards of our Church. New exposures of truth, Dr. Speer says, are to be expected from Christ or from the New Testament or from the Holy Spirit. What boundless confusion is

<sup>(1) &</sup>quot;What is needed", Dr. Speer says, (p.41), "is that everywhere in all lands men should be set free from what is evil and bad and that human good should be built by God's help through Christ and His Gospel." What a difference there is between this teaching and Jesus' words to Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again": Compare the beginning of Dr. Speer's book, "The Unfinished Task of Foreign Missions (1926), where, on pp. 10f., the use of human goodness - illustrated by Jerome K. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back" - is represented as being the method of Jesus!

is here, what woeful lack of clearness as to the very foundation of all missionary work! (1)

What is the missionary to say when he begins work on his field? Is he to appeal to a Christ in his own soul, is he to draw from his own experience for the content of his message, is he to place the treasures which he finds in the New Testament alongside of other treasures which he finds in Christ or in the Holy Spirit? If he does so, he has deserted the basis upon which all the teaching of our Church rests -- namely, the authority of the blessed written Word of God.

Very different should be the attitude of the true missionary of the Cross. His function is a humbler function, and yet a function which in its humility may prove to be the most glorious function of all. His function is not to draw upon mystical experience of his own for the content of his message, but simply to set forth what is taught in God's Word - - both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, both in the words of Jesus in the Gospels and in the words of the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of Paul. The function of the true missionary is simply to open the pages of the Holy Book and say: "Thus saith the Lord."

He cannot, indeed, do that with any power unless he has received the message in his own heart, unless he knows in his own soul the living Saviour whom the Scriptures present. The Holy Spirit must illumine for him the sacred page. But the content of his message will be based upon the Bible and upon the Bible alone.

When the message is based upon the Bible alone, the content of the message will be very different from that which now is heard. Gone will be all vagueness like the vagueness of Dr. Speer's little book. Instead, there will stand out the great verities which the Church is commissioned to set forth—the awful holiness of God, the deadly guilt and power of sin, the true deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His mighty miracles, His obedience to the law, His righteousness with which believers are clothed, His sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, His glorious resurrection in the body in which he suffered, His ascension into Heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the utter powerlessness of man, the sovereign grace of God by which alone are made alive those who were dead in trespasses and sins, the new and right relation to God received only by those in whom the Holy Spirit has wrought faith, the new walk and conversation of those who have been received by God and made alive from the dead, the dread yet glorious hope of Christ's supernatural appearing in glory when He shall come to judge

<sup>(1)</sup> Compare Dr. Speer's book "The New Opportunity of the Church", 1919, p. 44: "Deeper and more religious meanings than we have ever proclaimed are discerned in the Cross of Christ, revealed and illustrated in the war." Does Dr. Speer mean that these new "meanings" are deeper and more religious than those that are set forth in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians or in the eighth chapter of Romans? And have these Scriptural "meanings" never been proclaimed from New Testament times until the World War? Ah, how far are we here from the majestic simplicity of the gospel of the Cross:

the world.

A new and glorious day will it be for the distracted Church when that message again shall ring out clear, when there shall be a return from the imaginations of men's hearts to God's Holy Word. Meanwhile there are those who already love and honor that Word. What shall they do in the present day? Can they continue to support a mission agency that has wandered so far? There are many men and women in our Church who are raising that question. And they will raise it yet more earnestly if they read Dr. Speer's little book with care.

## CONCLUSION

should
What, then, evangelical Christians now do? Can they conscientiously continue their contributions to such a Board?

The question might seem to have been answered by what has already been said. But the answer is not really quite so simple as it seems. We ought never to forget that despite the attitude of the Board there are many faithful missionaries under the Board who are proclaiming the full gospel as it is set forth in the whole Word of God. Those faithful missionaries of the Cross should not be allowed to suffer because of the faults of the administrative agency under which they stand. Until some truly evangelical agency is formed to care for those faithful missionaries, evangelical people cannot withhold their support of the present Board.

But has the time not come for the establishment of a truly evangelical missionary agency in the Presbyterian Church — an agency to which evangelical Christians can contribute, not with hesitation and distrust, but with all confidence and joy, an agency which shall keep clear of entangling alliances and shall proclaim the full glories of the Reformed Faith as they are found in the Word of God? The question may well be raised; it may well be commended to the prayerful consideration of that large body of Christian laymen in our Church who love their Bibles and the crucified Saviour set forth therein, who know that the "principles of Jesus" will never save the world — nor what Dr. Speer calls his "redeeming life" (1)— but only His precious redeeming blood, who are not seeking the patronizing testimony of non-Christian men, which Dr. Speer rehearses at such length, but who are willing to bear the offense of the Cross.

If such an evangelical agency is formed, its virtue must be not merely negative but positive; it must not only avoid denying the gospel, but it must preach the gospel in all its fullness and in all its power. One fundamental vice underlies the defense of the present Board; its representatives seem to think that the burden of proof is to be placed upon those who deny that the Board is sounding an evangelical note. "Be definite in your charges", they say in effect; "point out individual missionaries against whom charges of

<sup>(1)</sup> The relation of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise to the World Situation of Today, "in Christian Students and World Problems, 1924, p. 139.

heresy can be preferred, or else keep silent with your criticism and continue your support." What is the trouble with such a line of defense? Is it not that the defense is negative merely? The assumption seems to be that if the missionaries or the secretaries of the Board cannot be proved to be saying that which is contrary to the gospel of Christ, then all is well. But cannot these gentlemen really understand any better then that the point of view of evangelical Christians in our Church? Cannot they understand that what evangelical Christians demand is not an agency that avoids denying the gospel of the Cross of Christ. that perhaps pays perfunctory lip service to it on explicit demand, but an agency that is on fire with that gospel, that never for one moment keeps it in the background, that preaches it in season and out of season, that combats what is contradictory to it, that presents it as the only way of salvation for lost and dying men? If in answer to the present paper Dr. Speer should affirm his belief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have been able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away -- if he should affirm his belief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn Affirmationists have done despite, if even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs, still our objections would not really be removed. What we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -- not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not, we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with His own precious blood. Woe be to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gospel than the gospel of the Cross. And may God show us how we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world!

## CAN EVANCELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

An Inquiry Presented for the Consideration of the Evangelical Members of the

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Ву

J. Gresham Machen

to give an account of its stewardship to those to whom it appeals. This principle applies to the Board of Foreign Missions of our Presbyterian Church. The Board is supported not by a tax levied on the members of the Church, but by voluntary contributions. If contributors think that their gifts are being devoted by the Board to the ends for the sake of which they have contributed them, then they will continue their support; otherwise they cannot reasonably be expected to do so.

There are some contributors who need have no hesitation about continuing their support of the Board. Those are the contributors that are interested in the social or material or educational aspects of the Board's work. It is perfectly clear that our Foreign Board is performing a valuable humanitarian service in many parts of the world, and those who want to contribute to such a humanitarian service may probably have confidence in this particular agency. But there are other contributors who may well have grave doubts as to whether they are justified in continuing their gifts. These are the contributors who are interested in propagating the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God. Can these Bible-loving and Bible-believing Christians conscientiously continue their support of our Foreign Board? About that question there is widespread doubt.

Obviously the question cannot possibly be answered by pronouncements of the General Assembly; for the distrust which evangelical Christians have with respect to the Board itself applies in equal measure to the Assembly. When, indeed. the issue between the Bible and modern unbelief is clearly presented, the Assembly usually stands on the side of the Bible; repeated pronouncements have affirmed that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of our Lord, are essential doctrines of our Faith. But these pronouncements have been made, practically speaking, a dead letter by the fact that the machinery of the Church is almost altogether in the hands of those who are concealing the real gravity of the situation that exists. Evasive reports as to the state of the Church, like that of the Commission of Fifteen of 1925-1927, will hardly restore the confidence of evangelical Christians; on the contrary, they will in the end do more to destroy confidence than any open presentation of the facts could possibly do. If, therefore, the Foreign Board is to regain the lost confidence of evangelical Christians

<sup>(1)</sup> The Assembly stood on the side of the Bible in the "Gantz case" in 1925. In 1927, in the judicial case concerning the licensure of candidates in the Presbytery of New York, it stood against the Bible and in favor of modern unbelief, but only because of the fact that the Moderator, Dr. Speer, quite illegally permitted the representatives of the Synod of New York, who were parties in interest, to vote in the case.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1910 confirmed by that of 1923 (Minutes, 1923, p. 253).

in the Church, it cannot do so by any appeal to ecclesiastical committees, but can only do so by meeting squarely the objections of individual givers. These individual givers must still raise the question: "Can evangelical Christians conscientiously contribute to our Foreign Board?"

I shall not now attempt to answer that question in any comprehensive way; I shall not attempt any comprehensive examination of the work which the Board is carrying on in foreign lands; but shall merely refer to certain disquieting facts which have come under my immediate observation. Those disquieting facts concern, first, the treatment of candidates for the mission field and, second, the pronouncements of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

I.

with regard to the former subject, my position as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary has given me rather unusual opportunities for observation. I have been thrown into close spiritual contact with a large body of young men who graduate from our Seminary from year to year. These young men, of course, differ widely as to the clearness with which they have received into their minds and hearts the gospel of the Cross of Christ; and, in particular, they differ widely in the degree of bravery with which they are resolved to proclaim that gospel in the presence of the unbelief now rampant in the Church. But the large majority of them — indeed a proportion truly amazing in view of the hostile

#4.
forces now abroad in the world - have resolved to stand firmly
for that gospel of the Cross, and firmly against the current
indifferentism and unbelief.

Some of these men have cherished as the ambition of their lives the thought of going to the foreign mission field. At last the time approaches for the realization of their high resolve. They meet in conference with representatives of our Board of Foreign Missions. What impression is made by these conferences upon their minds? Are these young men commended for the clearness with which they recognize the insufficiency of all other ways of salvation save the Cross of Christ considered as a substitutionary death for our sins; are they warned against the deadly peril of making common cause with those who preach the "other gospel" of agnostic Modernism; are they encouraged to trust, not in ecclesiastical combinations of human influences, but simply and solely in the Spirit of God making use of the blessed gospel that the Scriptures contain; are they commended for their understanding of the distinctiveness of our Reformed Faith over against various subtractions from the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God; are they confirmed in their sense of the high liberty of the Presbyterian minister whether at home or abroad? I can certainly, to say the least, find no clear evidence that such is the case. On the centrary, these young men, so far as I can judge by the spiritual effect on them, are given the impression that they are expected to conform to

the policy of church cooperation and union which the representatives of the Board favor, and that not separation from the non-Christian world, whether within or without the visible Church, but cooperation with those who differ from us is the crying need of the hour.

My impression with regard to this matter is strengthened by the official "Candidate Reference Blank" which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries. That reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others". "desire to progress in spiritual truth", "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions on this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ as it is set forth in Holy Scripture, and whether he himself is clear in

his understanding of the great issue between supernaturalism and naturalism, between evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the Church. There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Such a questionnaire, because of the choice of leading questions, creates very plainly the impression that "tolerance of opposing views" is far more valued by the Foreign Board than loyalty to the whole word of God.

The same impression is also created by the "Application Form" which the candidates themselves are asked to fill out. That form contains the following question (Section I, Question 17):

Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions?

It is difficult to see how any Christian man, certainly how any Protestant, can possibly answer such a question in the affirmative. The Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley, indeed, the Candidate Secretary of the Board, in his letter to me of March 8, 1928, distinguishes between "opinions" and "convictions":

This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout.

But in making this distinction between opinions and convictions,

Mr. Hadley seems to differ sharply from the form of government of our Church, where, in Chapter I, Section iv, it is said:

> And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are (italics mine).

Here the word "opinion" seems clearly to be used in the sense in which Mr. Hadley uses the word "conviction". And surely, in this difference, the Ferm of Government and not Mr. Hadley is right. The man who does not share a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as an "opinion"; the man who does share it is inclined to regard it as a "conviction". "Opinion" and "conviction", therefore, from the point of view with which we are now concerned, are practically speaking synonymous terms. I still do not see, therefore, how any evangelical Christian, in this day of widespread defection from the faith, can possibly answer in the affirmative the question in the Application Form.

This impression is deepened by an examination of Section IV in the Application Form, which deals with "Religious Experience". That section is declared by the Candidate Secretary in the letter to which reference has already been made, to be "very definite". The secretary writes as follows:

This Question (Question 17 of Section I), as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 3 under "Religious Experience", which, as you will see are very definite. (italics mine).

Let us now turn to those statements which Mr. Hadley declared to be "very definite". The only questions in the sections which can by any chance be referred to are Questions 3,5,6. The last two of these read as follows:

- 5. Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord, and Master?
- 6. Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your missionary career, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?

Are these the questions which Mr. Hadley regards as "very definite"? Surely the adjective as applied to them is strangely misplaced; for the questions are utterly vague. All the terms used - "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" - are used today in such widely diverse senses that the questions could be answered in the affirmative by men who from the point of view of the Bible and of evangelical Christians are unbelievers of a very thoroughgoing kind. That the Candidate Secretary of our Board of Foreign Missions should speak of such studiedly vague language as being "very definite" raises in very insistent fashion the question whether evangelical Christians can possibly continue

to contribute to such a Board.

This question becomes still more insistent when we examine the remaining one of the three questions to which reference has just been made. That question is Question 3. It reads as follows:

3. Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?

This question must surely be taken in connection with Question 17 of Section I which has been quoted above. The candidate must have no views that prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, and he must be willing to submit his opinion to the majority vote of any group of such missionaries to which he may belong. It is surely a large promise; and we ought to consider carefully what it may involve. What may those "opinions" be which the candidate must, on occasion, be allowed to over-ride his own?

The impression has certainly been made upon some candidates that among the opinions which he is required to allow to over-ride his own are opinions like those which led to the formation of the United Church of Canada; the impression has clearly been made that former service in the Presbyterian Church of Canada (called by its enemies the "Continuing" Presbyterian Church) is to be regarded as a ground of suspicion when a candidate comes before the representatives of our Board.

Mr. Hadley says that that is not the case; yet in view of his correspondence with me I cannot see how any other impression could possibly have been produced. The whole impression is that the candidate must be ready on occasion to give up the Faith of our Church in accordance with a majority vote, as though he were merely changing a suit of clothes.

At any rate there is one set of "opinions" with which a missionary in these days can hardly avoid contact. It is the kind of opinion represented by the "Amburn Affirmation", which declares in perfectly plain language that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracle of our Lord are non-essential even for the ministers in our Church. The Affirmation has been signed by about thirteen hundred of our ministers, and unquestionably the point of view that it represents is shared by very large numbers of ministers who did not sign it. What guarantee has the candidate that such opinions are not represented on our mission field, and that it is not to such opinions that he is being asked by Question 17 to be willing to submit his own?

But it is not merely such general disquietude that suggests itself in this connection. For it is a fact - a fact which will come as a surprise and shock to many evangelical Christians throughout the Church, but still a fact all the same - that Mr. Hadley, the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Board,

is himself a signer of the Affirmation. This secretary
who fills this peculiarly important position, who stands in
this peculiarly intimate relation to the men who desire to devote themselves to foreign mission work, is a signer of a
formal statement that is hostile not only to evangelical Christianity but to all Christianity at its very root.

The cancer of the Auburn Affirmation and what it represents, moreover, cuts far deeper into our Foreign Board than merely by the presence of an Affirmationist in the position of Candidate Secretary. No less than four among the fifteen ministerial members of the Board are signers of this notable anti-evangelical pronouncement. And what, in this situation, is the attitude of the staff, as distinguished from the governing members, of the Board? Dr. Robert E. Speer, surely, is qualified to give the answer. His answer is given in a letter which he sent to me, jointly with Dr. John A. Marquis of the Board of National Missions, on May 6, 1926:

First - all the members of the Boards of the Church were elected by the General Assembly. The Assembly clearly believed that they were loyal and faithful ministers and members of the Church. We know of not one who does not accept the Constitution and Standards of the Church and who is not truly and loyally evangelical.

At the time when that letter was written, no less than six out of fourteen ministerial members of the National Board and five out of fifteen ministerial members of the Foreign Board were

are regarded as "truly and loyally evangelical" by Dr. Marquis and Dr. Speer! What possible confidence can really consistent evangelical Christians have in Boards whose Standards of what is truly and loyally evangelical are such as that? What kind of mission work is it in which the full truthfulness of Holy Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our Lord are, all and severally, regarded as non-essential? Certainly it is a kind of mission work which no consistent evangelical Christian can support.

Is it such questions with regard to which candidates for the mission field are required to show "tolerance of the point of view of others"? The whole tendency, the whole attitude of the Candidate Department strongly creates such an impression. The question is not whether men who are lukewarm in their testimony sgainst Modernism will be sent to the foreign field, but whether men who are faithful in their testimony, will be sent. One thing at least is clear: No real evangelical Christian, certainly no intelligent one, can possibly, without disloyalty to his Saviour and Lord, contribute to any mission work that is favorable to the point of view represented by the Auburn Affirmation. The Affirmation is hostile to repeated pronouncements of the General

Assembly. But that is not the serious objection to it. The really serious objection to it is that it is hostile to the Word of God.

II.

A second cause of disquiet regarding the Foreign Board is found in the utterances of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

Among those utterances, one deserves special attention. It is the booklet, "Are Foreigh Missions Done For?", which Dr. Speer has recently distributed widely in the Church. "This little book", says the preface, "is an attempt to meet fairly and honestly some of the present day questions which are raised with regard to the foreign missionary enterprise." The booklet has been widely distributed, and evidently it is intended by its author to be an apologia for the work of our Foreign Board. Here then, if anywhere, the evangelical Christian might fairly expect to obtain some sort of answer to the questions which he has felt obliged to raise.

Are such expectations satisfied? We are obliged to say very plainly that they are not. Far from setting forth any clearly evangelical position on the great specific questions that agitate the Church, Dr. Speer's book from beginning to end is dishearteningly evasive and vague.

This vagueness appears in most distressing form just when the author seems to suppose that what he says is

particularly clear. No less than twice in the course of the book Dr. Speer quotes an utterance made by a conference held at Princeton in 1920. That utterance, he says. has "nothing uncertain or confused" about it; "it is definite and comprehensive"(p.56). The evangelical reader will naturally turn with high hopes to an utterance for which such claims are advanced. Surely, he will say, the utterance must set forth in no uncertain terms the authority of the written Word as over against the current mysticism that turns rather to Christian experience or Christ in the soul; surely it must declare the absolute necessity, for every missionary, of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

Are such hopes realized? What is this evangelical utterance which Dr. Speer declares to be so comprehensive and so plain? The evangelical Christian may have difficulty in believing his eyes when he finds that the following is all that it is:

The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these

<sup>(1)</sup> Pp. 56,81. In one other place, also, a practically identical declaration is quoted (p. 64).

disciples into Christian oburches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and selfgoverning; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

Such is the utterance which is declared to be so definite and so clear: No doubt it will seem clear to the agnostic Modernism that is rampant in our Church; for it is couched in just the vague, ambiguous language that modernism loves. All the terms, "Lord", "Divine Saviour", "disciples", and, alas, "Jesus Christ" - are used today in senses entirely alien to the Word of God; and the utterance ignores altogether the grand particularities of the Christian faith. The utterance speaks of "the spirit and principles of Christ": but "spirit" is spelled with a small letter and the Third Person of the blessed Trinity is ignored; the utterance speaks of Jesus as Saviour, but there is nothing about the sin from which He saves or the Cross by which salvation was wrought: the utterance speaks of bringing to bear upon human life "the spirit and principles of Christ", but there is nothing about the necessity of the mysterious, regenerating work of God's Spirit, without which "the spirit and principles of Christ" (whatever they may be) are quite powerless to save men from wrath to come. In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin. that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the

#16.

Word of God, and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the precious blood of Christ. Yet

Dr. Speer says (p.81): "No better answer can be given to those who wish to know what our foreign missionaries conceive that they are about and how they are setting about it than to quote the (1) more important of the Findings of this Conference". We can only say that if this be the answer which our Foreign

Board has to give regarding the content of the Christian message, then it is difficult to see how evangelical Christians can continue their support of the Board. So far as this declaration indicates, the Board may be propagating the vague "other gospel" of non-doctrinal Modernism just as probably as the blessed gospel that the Bible contains.

also characterizes the whole booklet of Dr. Speer. There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all), no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death

(2)

Of Christ? What sort of gospel is it from which all

<sup>(1)</sup> Then follows (pp.81-85) the paragraph quoted above and a fuller transcript of the findings of the Conference, which, however, does not really go beyond this paragraph so far as questions of principle are concerned.

<sup>(2)</sup> There is one bare mention of "the Crucified and ever Living Lord" (p. 37).

that makes a gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away, but so is the glory and the power.

In one thing, indeed, we agree heartily with Dr.

Speer. We agree with him heartily in holding that foreign
missions are not "done for"; we agree with him heartily in
holding that the "missionary enterprise" is the greatest enterprise in all the world.

Some of the testimonies to which he appeals seem to us, indeed, very unconvincing. These are the testimonies of non-Christian men in mission countries - testimonies to the "moral and spiritual values" of Christianity, to the loftiness of Jesus' teaching and example, to the transforming power of His "principles". Sadness comes over us as we read Dr. Speer's rehearsal of such testimonies. Would they ever have been rendered if missionaries had been faithful in preaching the real Christ? The plain fact is that the real Christ advanced stupendous claims. Unless those claims are true, He is not a perfect ideal at all. He uttered a "hard saying"; and many of his former followers went back and walked no more with Him. Has that hard saying been kept in the background today, that Jesus might win this superficial and patronizing favor among those who have not been born again? Could that favor ever have been won if missionaries had put

#18.

Calvary in its proper place, if they had been willing to bear the offence of the Cross? Such questions do arise in our minds when we read Dr. Speer's enthusiastic words about the permeation of the nations with Christian principles and the Christian "spirit".

We do not, indeed, undervalue a good testimony to Christian living by those who are without. How often in recent years has such testimony been wrung from unwilling lips by those who amid the fires of persecution have been true to Jesus Christ! Still, the message of the Cross, when it is faithfully presented, is a very offensive thing. It is to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. When the offence of it is avoided, we are inclined to doubt the faithfulness of the preaching. God grant that the Church, both at home and abroad, may never be ashamed of the offence of the Cross!

But if we differ from Dr. Speer in the arguments by which we defend foreign missions, we agree with him with all our soul in the conclusion. We agree with him in holding that foreign missions are the only hope of the world. Indeed, far more poignant is our sense of the need of foreign missions than is his. For we do not share his favorable view of (1) human nature; the primary fact, we hold, is that mankind

<sup>(1) &</sup>quot;What is needed" Dr. Speer says (p.41), "is that everywhere in all lands man should be set free from what is evil and bad and that human good should be built by God's help through Christ and His Gospel." What a difference there is between this teaching and Jesus' words to Nicodemus: "Ye must be born again": Compare the beginning of Dr. Speer's book, "The unfinished Task of Foreign Missions (1926), where, on pp. lof., the use of human goodness — illustrated by Jerome K. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back"—is represented as being the method of Jesus!

everywhere is lost in sin. We cannot keep that fact in the background as Dr. Speer does. It and it alone constitutes the really
profound need of the world. How great then is the obligation to
preach the one message that will save lost sinners and bring them
into peace with God:

But where is that message to be found? Where are missionaries to find the message that they shall proclaim throughout the world? That is surely a basic question. Yet no clear answer to it can be found in Dr. Speer's book - - certainly not the true answer. Dr. Speer speaks of "the search for the infinite riches of God in Christ" (p.37), "a quest for an ever enlarging understanding of the fulness of Christ" (ibid.); but nowhere does he speak of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the true source of the missionary message. He hopes for "some exposure of treasures in Christ or in the New Testament or in the Holy Spirit which have been hidden as yet". (p.46). We cannot help feeling that the Bible is here removed from the unique place in which it is put - and rightly put - in the Standards of our Church. New exposures of truth, Dr. Speer says, are to be expected from Christ or from the New Testament or from the Holy Spirit. boundless confusion is here, what woeful lack of clearness as to the very foundation of all missionary work!

<sup>(1)</sup> Compare Dr. Speer's book "The New Opportunity of the Church", 1919, p.44: "Deeper and more religious meanings than we have everproclaimed are discerned in the Cross of Christ, revealed, and illustrated in the war." Does Dr. Speer mean that these new "meanings" are deeper and more religious than those that are set forth in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians or in the eighth chapter of Romans? And have these Scriptural "meanings" never been proclaimed from New Testament times until the World War? Ah, how far are we here from the majestic simplicity of the gospel of the Cross:

What is the missionary to say when he begins work on his field? Is he to appeal to a Christ in his own soul, is he to draw from his own experience for the content of his message, is he to place the treasures which he finds in the New Testament alongside of other treasures which he finds in Christ or in the Holy Spirit? If he does so, he has deserted the basis upon which all the teaching of our Church rests - - namely, the authority of the blessed written word of God.

Very different should be the attitude of the true missionary of the Cross. His function is a humbler function, and yet a function which in its humility may prove to be the most glorious function of all. His function is not to draw upon mystical experiences of his own for the content of his message, but simply to set forth what is taught in God's Word — both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, both in the words of Jesus in the Gospels and in the words of the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of Paul. The function of the true missionary is simply to open the pages of the Holy Book and say: "Thus saith the Lord."

He cannot, indeed, do that with any power unless he has received the message in his own heart, unless he knows in his own soul the living Saviour whom the Scriptures present. The Holy Spirit must illumine for him the sacred page. But the content of his message will be based upon the Bible and upon the Bible alone.

When the message is based upon the Bible alone, the content of the message will be very different from that which now is

Gone will be all vagueness like the vagueness of Dr. Speer's little book. Instead, there will stand out the great verities which the Church is commissioned to set forth -- the awful holiness of God, the deadly guilt and power of sin. the true deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His mighty miracles, His obedience to the law, His righteousness with which believers are clothed. His sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God. His glorious resurrection in the body in which he suffered. His ascension into Heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the utter powerlessness of man, the sovereign grace of God by which alone are made alive those who were dead in trespasses and sins, the new and right relation to God received only by those in whom the Holy Spirit has wrought faith, the new walk and conversation of those who have been received by God and made alive from the dead, the dread yet glorious hope of Christ's supernatural appearing in glory when He shall come to judge the world.

A new and glorious day will it be for a distracted Church when that message again shall ring out clear, when there shall be a return from the imaginations of men's hearts to God's holy Word.

Meanwhile there are those who already love and honor that Word.

What shall they do in the present day? Can they continue to support a mission agency that has wandered so far? There are many men and women in our Church who are raising that question. And they will raise it yet more earnestly if they read Dr. Speer's little book with care.

What, then, should evangelical Christians now do? Can they conscientiously continue their contributions to such a Board?

The question might seem to have been answered by what has already been said. But the answer is not really quite so simple as it seems. We ought never to forget that despite the attitude of the Board there are many faithful missionaries under the Board who are proclaiming the full gospel as it is set forth in the whole Word of God. Those faithful missionaries of the Cross should not be allowed to suffer because of the faults of the administrative agency under which they stand. Until some truly evangelical agency is formed to care for those faithful missionaries, evangelical people cannot withhold their support of the present Board.

But has the time not come for the establishment of a truly evangelical missionary agency in the Presbyterian Church — an agency to which evangelical Christians can contribute, not with hesitation and distrust, but with all confidence and joy, an agency which shall keep clear of entangling alliances and shall proclaim the full glories of the Reformed Faith as they are found in the word of God? The question may well be raised; it may well be commended to the prayerful consideration of that large body of Christian laymen in our Church who love their Bibles and the crucified Saviour set forth therein, who know that the "principles of Jesus" will never save the world — nor what Dr. Speer calls His "redeeming life" — but only His precious redeeming blood,

<sup>(1)</sup> The Relation of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise to the World Situation Today," in Christian Students and World Problems, 1924, p. 139.

who are not seeking the patronizing testimony of non-Christian men, which Dr. Speer rehearses at such length, but who are willing to bear the offence of the Cross.

If such an evangelical agency is formed, its virtues must be not merely negative but positive; it must not only avoid denying the gospel, but it must preach the gospel in all its fullness and in all its power. One fundamental vice underlies the defence of the present Board: its representatives seem to think that the burden of proof is to be placed upon those who deny that the Board is sounding an evangelical note. "Be definite in your charges", they say in effect: "point out individual missionaries against whom charges of heresy can be preferred, or else keep silent with your criticism and continue your support." What is the trouble with such a line of defence? Is it not that the defence is negative merely? The assumption seems to be that if the missionaries or the secretaries of the Board cannot be proved to be saying that which is contrary to the gospel of Christ, then all is well. But cannot these gentlemen really understand any better than that the point of view of evangelical Christians in Cannot they understand that what evangelical Christour Church? ians demand is not an agency that avoids denying the gospel of the Cross of Christ, that perhaps pays perfunctory lip service to it on explicit demand, but an agency that is on fire with that gospel, that never for one moment keeps it in the background, that preaches it in season and out of season, that combats what is contradictory to it, that presents it as the only way of salvation for lost and

dying men? If in answer to the present paper Dr. Speer should affirm his belief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have been able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away - - if he should affirm his belief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn Affirmationists have done despite, if even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs, still our objections would not really be removed. What we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -- not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not, we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with His own precious blood. Woe be to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gospel than the gospel of the Cross. And may God show us how we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world!

dying men? If in answer to the present paper Dr. Speer should affirm his belief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have been able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away - - if he should affirm his belief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn Affirmationists have done despite, if even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs. still our objections would not really be removed. What we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -- not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not. we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with His own precious blood. Woe be to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gospel than the gospel of the Cross. And may God show us how we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world!

An Inquiry Presented for the Consideration of the Evangelical Members

of the

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

Ву

J. Gresham Machen

Every agency appealing for funds should be willing to give an account of its stewardship to those to whom it appeals. This principle applies to the Board of Foreign Missions of our Presbyterian Church. The Board is supported not by a tax levied on the members of the Church, but by voluntary contributions. If contributors think that their gifts are being devoted by the Board to the ends for the make of which they have contributed them, then they will continue their support; otherwise they cannot reasonably be expected to do so.

There are some contributors who need have no hesitation about continuing their support of the Board. Those are the contributors that are interested in the social or material or educational aspects of the Board's work. It is perfectly clear that our Foreign Board is performing a valuable humanitarian service in many parts of the world, and those who want to contribute to such a humanitarian service may probably have confidence in this particular agency. But there are other contributors who may well have grave doubts as to whether they are justified in continuing their gifts. These are the contributors who are interested in propagating the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is contained in the whole Word of God. Can these Bible-loving and Bible-believing Christians conscientiously continue their support of our Foreign Board?

Obviously the question cannot possibly be answered by pronouncements of the General Assembly; for the distrust which evangelical Christians have with respect to the Board itself applies in equal measure to the Assembly. When, indeed, the issue between the Bible and modern belief is clearly presented, the Assembly usually stands on the side of the Bible: [1] repeated pronouncements have affirmed that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonesent, the bodily resurrection, and the miracles of our Lord, are essential doctrines of our Faith [2]. But these pronouncements have been made, practically speaking, a dead letter by the fact that the machinery of the Church is almost altogether in the hands of those who are concealing the real gravity of the situation that exists. Evasive reports as to the state of the Church, like that of the Commission of Fifteen of 1925-1927, will hardly restore the confidence of evangelical Christians; on the contrary, they will in the end do more to destroy confidence than any open presentation of the facts could possibly do. If, therefore, the Foreign Board is to regain the lost confidence of evangelical Christians in the Church, it cannot do so by any appeal to ecclesiastical

<sup>(1)</sup> The assembly stood on the side of the Bible in the "Gantz case" in 1925. In 1927, in the judicial case concerning the licensure of candidates in the Presbytery of New York, it stood against the Bible and in favor of modern unbelief, but only because of the fact that the Moderator, Br. Speer, quite illegally permitted the representatives of the Synod of New York, who were parties in interest, to vote in the case.

<sup>(2)</sup> See the pronouncement of the General Assembly of 1910 confirmed by that of 1923 (Einstee, 1923, p. 253).

committees, but can only do so by meeting squarely the objections of individual givers. These individual givers must still raise the question: "Can evangelical Christians conscientiously contribute to our Foreign Board?"

I shall not now attempt to answer that question in any comprehensive way; I shall not attempt any comprehensive examination of the work which the Board is carrying on in foreign lands; but shall merely refer to certain disquieting facts which have come under my immediate observation. Those disquieting facts concern, first, the treatment of candidates for the mission field and, second, the pronouncements of Dr. Robert E. Speer.

I.

With regard to the former subject, my position as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary has given me rather unusual opportunities for observation. I have been thrown into close spiritual contact with a large body of young men who graduate from our seminary from year to year. These young men, of course, differ widely as to the clearness with which they have received into their minds and hearts the gospel of the Cross of Christ; and, in particular, they differ widely in the degree of bravery with which they are resolved to proclaim that gospel in the presence of the unbelief now rampant in the Church. But the large majority of them - indeed a proportion truly amazing in view of the hostile forces now abroad in the world - have resolved to stand firmly for that gospel of the Cross, and firmly against the current indifferentism and unbelief.

Some of these men have cherished as the ambition of their lives the thought of going to the foreign mission field. At last the time approaches for the realization of their high resolve. They meet in conference with representatives of our Board of Foreign Missions. What impression is made by these conferences upon their minds? Are these young men commended for the clearness with which they recognize the insufficiency of all other ways of salvation save the Cross of Christ considered as a substitutionary death for our sins; are they warned against the deadly peril of making common cause with those who preach the "other gospel" of agnostic Modernism; are they encouraged to trust, not in ecclesiastical combinations of human influences, but simply and solely in the Spirit of God making use of the blessed gospel that the Scriptures contain; are they commended for their understanding of the distincti eness of our Reformed Faith over against various subtractions from the full Scripture doctrine of the grace of God; are they confirmed in their sense of the high liberty of the Presbyterian minister whether at home or abroad? I can certainly, to say the least, find no clear evidence that such is the case. On the contrary, these young men, so far as I can judge by the spiritual effect on them, are given the impression that they are expected to conform to the policy of church sooperation and union which the representatives of the Board favor, and that not separation from the non-Christian world, whether within or without the visible Church, but cooperation with those who differ from us is the crying need of the hour.

My impression with regard to this matter is strengthened by the

official "Candidate Reference Blank" which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries. The reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others", "desire to progress in spiritual truth," "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions on this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ as it is set forth in Holy Scripture, and whether he himself is clear in his . understanding of the great issue between supernaturalism and naturalism, between evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the Church. There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Such a questionnaire, because of the choice of leading questions, creates very plainly the impression that "tolerance of opposing views" is far more valued by the Foreign Board than loyalty to the whole Word of God.

The same impression is also created by the "Application Form" which the candidates themselves are asked to fill out. That form contains the following question "Section I, question 17):

Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions?

It is difficult to see how any Christian man, certainly how any Protestant, can possibly answer such a question in the affirmative. The Rev. Lindsay S.B. Hadley, indeed, the Candidate Secretary of the Board, in his letter to me of March 8, 1928, distinguishes between "opinions" and "convictions":

This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which m turally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout.

But in making this distinction between opinions and convictions, Mr. Hadley seems to differ sharply from the Form of Government of our Church, where in Chapter I, Section iv, it is said:

And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, then that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are (italics mine). Here the word "opinion" seems clearly to be used in the sense in which Mr. Hadley uses the word "conviction". And surely, in this difference, the Form of Government and not Mr. Hadley is right. The man who does not share a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as an "opinion"; the man who does share it is inclined to regard it as a "conviction". "Opinion" and "conviction", therefore, from the point of view with which we are now concerned, are practically speaking synonymous terms. I still do not see, therefore, how any evangelical Christian, in this day of widespread defection from the faith, can possibly answer in the affirmative the question in the Application Form.

This impression is deepened by an examination of Section IV in the Application Form, which deals with "Religious Experience". That section is declared by the Candidate Secretary in the letter to which reference has already been made, to be "very definite". The secretary writes as follows:

This question (question 17 of Section I) as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 3 under "Religious Experience", which, as you will see zre very definite (italics mine).

Let us now turn to those statements which Mr. Hadley declared to be "very definite". The only questions in the section which can by any chance be referred to are questions 3.5.6. The last two of these read as follows:

- 5. Do you believe that in every form of mission work the paramount duty of every missionary is to make Jesus Christ known as Saviour, Lord, and Master?
- 6. Is it your purpose to make this the chief aim of your missionary career, no matter what special duties may be assigned to you?

Are these the questions which Mr. Hadley regards as "very definite"?

Surely the adjective as applied to them is strangely misplaced; for the questions are utterly vague. All the terms used - "Saviour", "Lord" and "Master" - are used today in such widely diverse senses that the questions could be answered in the affirmative by men who from the point of view of the Bible and of evangelical Christians are unbelievers of a very thoroughgoing kind. That the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Missions should speak of such studiedly vague language as being "very definite" raises in very insistent fashion the question whether evangelical Christians can possibly continue to contribute to such a Board.

This question becomes still more insistent when we examine the remaining one of the three questions to which reference has just been made.

That question is question 3. It reads as follows:

3. Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?

This question must surely be taken in connection with Question 17 of Section I which has been quoted above. The candidate must have no views that prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church, and he must be willing to submit his opinion to the majority vote of any group of such missionaries to which he may belong. It is surely a large promise; and we ought to consider carefully what it may involve. What may those "opinions" be which the candidate must, on occasion, be allowed to override his own?

The impression has certainly been made upon some candidates that among the opinions which he is required to allow to over-ride his own are opinions like those which led to the formation of the United Church of Canada; the impression has clearly been made that former service in the Presbyterian Church of Canada (called by its enemies the "Continuing Presbyterian Church) is to be regarded as a ground of suspicion when a candidate comes before the representatives of our Board. Mr. Hadley says that that is not the case; yet in view of his correspondence with me I cannot see how any other impression could possibly have been produced. The whole impression is that the candidate must be ready on occasion to give up the Faith of our Church in accordance with a majority vote, as though he were merely changing a suit of clothes.

At any rate there is one set of "opinions" with which a missionary in these days can hardly avoid contact. It is the kind of opinion represented by the "Auburn Affirmation", which declares in perfectly plain language that the full truthfulness of Scripture, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the bodily resurrection and the miracles of our bord are non-essential even for the ministers in our Church. The Affirmation has been signed by about thirteen hundred of our ministers, and unquestionably the point of view that it represents is shared by very large numbers of ministers who did not sign it. What guarantee has the candidate that such opinions are not represented on our mission field, and that it is not to such opinions that he is being asked by question 17 to be willing to submit his own?

But it is not merely such general disquietude that suggests itself in this connection. For it is a fact - a fact which will come as a surprise and shock to many evangelical Christians throughout the Church, but still a fact all the same - that Mr. Hadley, the Candidate Secretary of our Foreign Board, is himself a signer of the Affirmation. This Secretary, who fills this peculiarly important position, who stands in this peculiarly intimete relation to the men who desire to devote themselves to foreign mission work, is a signer of a formal statement that is hostile not only to evangelical Christianity but to all Christianity at its very root.

The cancer of the Auburn Affirmation and what it represents, moreover, cuts far deeper into our Foreign Board than merely by the presence of an

tributed widely in the Church. "This little book", says the preface, "is an attempt to meet fairly and honestly some of the present day questions which are raised with regard to the foreign missionary enterprise." The booklet has been widely distributed, and evidently it is intended by its author to be an apologia for the work of our Foreign Board. Here then, if anywhere, the evangelical Christian might fairly expect to obtain some sort of answer to the questions which he has felt obliged to raise.

Are such expectations satisfied? We are obliged to say very plainly that they are not. Far from setting forth any clearly evangelical position on the great specific questions that agitate the Church, Dr. Speer's book from beginning to end is dishearteningly evasive and vague.

This vagueness appears in most distressing form just when the author seems to suppose that what he says is particularly clear. No less than twice in the course of the book Dr. Speer quotes an utterance made by a conference held at Princeton in 1920 (1). That utterance, he says has "nothing uncertain or confused" about it; "it is definite and comprehensive" (p.56). The evangelical reader will naturally turn with high hopes to an utterance for which such claims are advanced. Surely, he will say, the utterance must set forth in no uncertain terms the authority of the written Word as over against the current mysticism that turns rather to Christian experience or Christ in the soul; surely it must declare the absolute necessity, for every missionary, of belief in the virgin birth of our Lord, in His bodily resurrection, in His substitutionary death as a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, in His supernatural return, in the absolute necessity of the new birth as over against any development of human goodness, in justification by faith alone, in salvation by the sovereign grace of God.

Are such hopes realized? What is this evangelical utterance which Dr. Speer declares to be so comprehensive and so plain? The evangelical Christian may have difficulty in believing his eyes when he finds that the following is all that it is:

"The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make the Lord Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Saviour and to persuade them to become His disciples; to gather these disciples into Christian churches which shall be self-propagating, self-supporting, and self-governing; to cooperate, so long as necessary, with these churches in the evangelizing of their countrymen and in bringing to bear on all human life the spirit and principles of Christ."

<sup>(1)</sup> Pp. 56, 81. In one other place, also, a practically identical declaration is quoted. (p. 64).

Such is the utterance which is declared to be so definite and so clear! No doubt it will seem clear to the agnostic Modernism that is rampant in our Church: for it is couched in just the vague, ambiguous language that Wodernism loves. All the terms - "Lord", "Divine Saviour", "disciples", and, alas, "Jesus Christ" are used today in senses entirely alien to the Word of God; and the utterance ignores altogether the grand particularities of the Christian faith. The utterance speaks of "the spirit and principles of Christ"; but "spirit" is spelled with a small letter and the Third Person of the blessed Trinity is ignored: the utterance speaks of Jesus as Saviour, but there is nothing about the sin from which He saves or the Cross by which salvation was wrought; the utterance speaks of bringing to bear upon human life "the spirit and principles of Christ". but there is nothing about the necessity of the mysterious, regenerating work of God's Spirit, without which "the spirit and principles of Christ" (whatever they may be) are quite powerless to save men from wrath to come. In short, there is no hint here that the foreign missionary has a message to mankind lost in sin, that that message is contained solely in the Bible as the word of God. and that the heart and core of the message is found in redemption by the precious blood of Christ. Yet Dr. Speer says (p.81): "No better answer can be given to those who wish to know what our foreign missionaries conceive that they are about and how they are setting about it than to quote the more important of the Findings of this Conference". (1) We can only say that if this be the answer which our Foreign Board has to give regarding the content of the Christian message, then it is difficult to see how evangelical Christians can continue their support of the Board. So far as this declaration indicates, the Board may be propagating the vague "other gospel" of non-doctrinal Modernism just as probably as the blessed gospel that the Bible contains.

The vagueness that characterizes this utterance also characterizes the whole booklet of Dr. Speer. There is in it no mention of the virgin birth of our Lord and of the absolute necessity of belief in it for every missionary, no mention of the bodily resurrection, no mention of the full truthfulness of Scripture (indeed no mention of Scripture, as such, at all), no mention of the supernatural return of Christ, no mention of the new birth of believers, no mention of justification by faith, no mention of the atoning death of Christ? What sort of gospel is it from which all that makes a gospel has thus been left out? In this vague message the offense of the Cross is done away, but so is the glory and the power.

Some of the testimonies to which he appeals seem to us, indeed, very unconvincing. There are the testimonies of non-Christian men in mission countries - testimonies to the "moral and spiritual values" of Christianity, to the loftimess of Jesus' teaching and example, to the transforming power of His "principles." Sadness comes over us as we read Dr. Speer's rehearsal of such testimonies. Would they ever have been rendered if missionaries had been faithful in preaching the real Christ? The plain fact is that the real Christ advanced stupendous claims. Unless those claims are true, He is not a perfect

(2) There is one bare mention of "the Crucified and ever Living Lord". (p. 37).

<sup>(1)</sup> Then follows (pp.81-85) the paragraph quoted above and a fuller transcript of the findings of the Conference, which, however, does not really go beyond this paragraph so far as questions of principles are concerned.

ideal at all. He uttered a "hard saying"; and many of His former followers went back and walked no more with Him. Has that hard saying been kept in the background today, that Jesus might win this superficial and patronizing favor among those who have not been born again? Could that favor ever have been won if missionaries had put Calvary in its proper place, if they had been willing to bear the offense of the Cross? Such questions do arise in our minds when we read Dr. Speer's enthusiastic words about the permeation of the nations with Christian principles and the Christian "spirit".

We do not, indeed, undervalue a good testiment to Christian living by those who are without. How often in recent years has such testiment been wrung from unwilling lips by those who amid the fires of persecution have been true to Jesus Christ: Still, the message of the Cross, when it is faithfully presented, is a very offensive thing. It is to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. When the offense of it is avoided, we are inclined to doubt the faithfulness of the preaching. God grant that the Church, both at home and abroad, may never be ashamed of the offense of the Cross:

But if we differ from Dr. Speer in the arguments by which we defend foreign missions, we agree with him with all our souls in the conclusion. We agree with him in holding that foreign missions are the only hope of the world. Indeed far more poignant is our sense of the need of foreign missions than is his. For we do not share his favorable view of human nature (1); the primary fact, we hold, is that mankind everywhere is lost in sin. We cannot keep that fact in the background as Dr. Speer does. It and it alone constitutes the really profound need of the world. How great then is the obligation to preach the one message that will save lost sinners and bring them into peace with God:

But where is that message to be found? Where are missionaries to find the message that they shall proclaim throughout the world? That is surely a basic question. Yet no clear answer to it can be found in Dr. Speer's book — certainly not the true answer. Dr. Speer speaks of "the search for the infinite riches of God in Christ" (p.37), "a quest for an ever enlarging understanding of the fulness of Christ" (ibid.); but nowhere does he speak of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the true source of the missionary message. He hopes for "some exposure of treasures in Christ or in the New Testament or in the Holy Spirit which have been hidden as yet". (p.46) We cannot help feeling that the Bible is here removed from the unique place in which it is put — and rightly put — in the standards of our Church. New exposures of truth, Dr. Speer says, are to be expected from Christ or from the New Testament or from the Holy Spirit. What boundless confusion is

<sup>(1) &</sup>quot;What is needed", Dr. Speer says, (p.41), "is that everywhere in all lands men should be set free from what is evil and bad and that human good should be built by God's help through Christ and His Gospel." What a difference there is between this teaching and Jesus' words to Nicodemush "Ye must be born again"! Compare the beginning of Dr. Speer's book, "The Unfinished Task of Foreign Missions (1926), where, on pp. 10f., the use of human goodness - illustrated by Jerome K. Jerome's "Passing of the Third Floor Back" - is represented as being the method of Jesus!

is here, what woeful lack of clearness as to the very foundation of all missionary work: (1)

What is the missionary to say when he begins work on his field? Is he to appeal to a Christ in his own soul, is he to draw from his own experience for the content of his message, is he to place the treasures which he finds in the New Testament alongside of other treasures which he finds in Christ or in the Holy Spirit? If he does so, he has deserted the basis upon which all the teaching of our Church rests -- namely, the authority of the blessed written Word of God.

Very different should be the attitude of the true missionary of the Cross. His function is a humbler function, and yet a function which in its humility may prove to be the most glorious function of all. His function is not to draw upon mystical experience of his own for the content of his message, but simply to set forth what is taught in God's Word — — both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, both in the words of Jesus in the Gospels and in the words of the Holy Spirit in the Epistles of Paul. The function of the true missionary is simply to open the pages of the Holy Book and say: "Thus saith the Lord."

He cannot, indeed, do that with any power unless he has received the message in his own heart, unless he knows in his own soul the living Saviour whom the Scriptures present. The Holy Spirit must illumine for him the sacred page. But the content of his message will be based upon the Bible and upon the Bible alone.

When the message is based upon the Bible alone, the content of the message will be very different from that which now is heard. Gone will be all vagueness like the vagueness of Dr. Speer's little book. Instead, there will stand out the great verities which the Church is commissioned to set forth—the awful holiness of God, the deadly guilt and power of sin, the true deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His mighty miracles, His obedience to the 1 w, His righteousness with which believers are clothed, His sacrifice to satisfy divine justice and reconcile us to God, His glorious resurrection in the body in which he suffered, His ascension into Heaven, the sending of the Holy Spirit, the utter powerlessness of man, the sovereign grace of God by which alone are made alive those who were dead in trespasses and sins, the new and right relation to God received only by those in whom the Holy Spirit has wrought faith, the new walk and conversation of those who have been received by God and made alive from the dead, the dread yet glorious hope of Christ's supernatural appearing in glory when He shall come to judge

<sup>(1)</sup> Compare Dr. Speer's book "The New Opportunity of the Church", 1919, p. 44: "Deeper and more religious meanings than we have ever proclaimed are discerned in the Cross of Christ, revealed and illustrated in the war." Does Dr. Speer mean that these new "meanings" are deeper and more religious than those that are set forth in the fifth chapter of II Corinthians or in the eighth chapter of Romans? And have these Scriptural "meanings" never been proclaimed from New Testament times until the World War? Ah, how far are we here from the majestic simplicity of the gospel of the Cross:

the world.

A new and glorious day will it be for the distracted Church when that message again shall ring out clear, when there shall be a return from the imaginations of men's hearts to God's Holy Word. Meanwhile there are those who already love and honor that Word. What shall they do in the present day? Can they continue to support a mission agency that has wandered so far? There are many men and women in our Church who are raising that question. And they will raise it yet more earnestly if they read Dr. Speer's little book with care.

## CONCLUSION

should What, then, evangelical Christians now do? Can they conscientiously continue their contributions to such a Board?

The question might seem to have been answered by what has already been said. But the answer is not really quite so simple as it seems. We ought never to forget that despite the attitude of the Board there are many faithful missionaries under the Board who are proclaiming the full gospel as it is set forth in the whole Word of God. Those faithful missionaries of the Cross should not be allowed to suffer because of the faults of the administrative agency under which they stand. Until some truly evangelical agency is formed to care for those faithful missionaries, evangelical people cannot withhold their support of the present Board.

evangelical missionary agency in the Presbyterian Church — an agency to which evangelical Christians can contribute, not with hesitation and distrust, but with all confidence and joy, an agency which shall keep clear of entangling alliances and shall proclaim the full glories of the Reformed Faith as they are found in the Word of God? The question may well be raised; it may well be commended to the prayerful consideration of that large body of Christian laymen in our Church who love their Bibles and the crucified Saviour set forth therein, who know that the "principles of Jesus" will never save the world — nor what Dr. Speer calls his "redeeming life" [1]— but only His precious redeeming blood, who are not seeking the patronizing testimony of non-Christian men, which Dr. Speer rehearses at such length, but who are willing to bear the offense of the Cross.

If such an evangelical agency is formed, its virtue must be not merely negative but positive; it must not only avoid denying the gospel, but it must preach the gospel in all its fullness and in all its power. One fundamental vice underlies the defense of the present Board; its representatives seem to think that the burden of proof is to be placed upon those who deny that the Board is sounding an evangelical note. "Be definite in your charges", they say in effect; "point out individual missionaries against whom charges of

<sup>(1)</sup> The relation of the Foreign Missionary Enterprise to the World Situation of Today," in Christian Students and World Problems, 1924, p. 139.

heresy can be preferred, or else keep silent with your criticism and continue your support." What is the trouble with such a line of defense? Is it not that the defense is negative merely? The assumption seems to be that if the missionaries or the secretaries of the Board cannot be proved to be saying that which is contrary to the gospel of Christ, then all is well. But cannot these centlemen really understand any better then that the point of view of evangelical Christians in our Church? Cannot they understand that what evangelical Christians demand is not an agency that avoids denying the gospel of the Cross of Christ, that perhaps pays perfunctory lip sorvice to it on explicit demand, but an agency that is on fire with that gospel, that never for one moment keeps it in the background, that preaches it in season and out of season, that combats what is contradictory to it, that presents it as the only way of salvation for lost and dying men? If in answor to the present paper br. Speer should affirm his belief in the atonement of Christ -- that heart of the gospel which, so far as we have been able to observe, he has in his recent books dealt with only to bring it into connection with the death of soldiers in the war, or otherwise to explain it away -- if he should affirm his belief in the virgin birth of Christ, and in the other four basic elements of our faith to which the Auburn Affirmationists have done despite, if even he should affirm his conviction of the necessity of these beliefs, still our objections would not really be removed. What we long for is not a missionary agency that affirms belief in the essential things of the faith when asked to do so, but a missionary agency that proclaims those things joyously, spontaneously, and all the time. The difference here concerns the question where the really central emphasis is to be placed. It is not merely a difference of the mind, but a difference of the heart. What is the real impact of our Foreign Board upon the world? Is it the preaching of Christ crucified -- not in some pale modern sense, not as a thing upon which new light is shed by the death of soldiers in the war, but as a blessed mystery revealed in the Word of God? If it is, then we can support that Board? But if not, we must seek some other agency that will proclaim this thing which to us is the breath of life. Christ has bought us with His own precious blood. Woe be to us if we proclaim, either by our words or by our gifts, some other gospel than the gospel of the Cross. And may God show us how we can best proclaim that gospel through the length and breadth of the world;